Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5854th meeting

Tuesday, 18 March 2008, 5 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Churkin	(Russian Federation)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Wang Guangya
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Jurica
	France	Mr. Ripert
	Indonesia	Mr. Natalegawa
	Italy	Mr. Mantovani
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Ettalhi
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	South Africa	Mr. Sangqu
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Ms. Pierce
	United States of America	Mr. Khalilzad
	Viet Nam	Mr. Le Luong Minh

Agenda

The situation in Myanmar

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

08-27488 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 5.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Myanmar

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Myanmar, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the consideration of the item, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kyaw Tint Swe (Myanmar) took a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Gambari to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I now give the floor to Mr. Ibrahim Gambari, Special Envoy of the Secretary-General.

Mr. Gambari: I thank all members of the Security Council for the opportunity to brief them on my latest visit to Myanmar, from 6 to 10 March 2008, in the implementation of the good offices role entrusted to the Secretary-General by the General Assembly. In accordance with the usual practice, I have already reported to the President of the Assembly and would like, respectfully, to refer the Council to the press release issued yesterday by his Office in that regard.

At the outset, I would like to thank the Government and the people of Myanmar for the hospitality extended to my delegation and to me during our five-day visit. In particular, I wish to place on record my gratitude for the Government's efforts in bringing forward my visit from mid-April, as previously scheduled, to early March and also in extending my stay by one day.

Since assuming responsibility for the Myanmar dossier, I have never been under any illusion that the engagement process will be smooth sailing. Indeed, over time my engagement with my interlocutors has been difficult, complex and frustrating at times, but nevertheless incremental and continuing. That is invariably the nature of the good-offices role of the Secretary-General.

But, in terms of the programme of my last visit, I am grateful to the Myanmar authorities for having granted most of the meetings I requested, including two meetings with the Government Authoritative Spokesperson's Team, representing the State Peace and Development Council and composed of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, Culture and Information. I also met with the Ministers for Planning and Health, the Deputy Foreign Minister and the Referendum Convening Commission, as well as the Constitution Drafting Committee. I also met twice with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and with the political parties, including the National League for Democracy (NLD), the National Unity Party (NUP) and the PaO National Organization — which is for the ethnic and nationality groups — as well as the Union Solidarity and Development Association (USDA) — not to be confused with the United States Department of Agriculture, of course. In addition, I met twice with the United Nations country team on United Nations premises and with the diplomatic corps at the beginning and at the end of my visit, as well as with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).

Unlike last time, when I stayed mostly in Nay Pyi Taw, the new capital, the Government arranged for my delegation and me to stay in a hotel in Yangon throughout our visit. I regret, however, that I was not able to meet with the senior Government leadership or with other political parties, including the 88 Generation group and the 1990 MPs-Elect, or with representatives of ethnic minority groups.

Moreover, whereas each of my previous visits produced some tangible results that could be built upon, it is a source of disappointment that this latest visit did not yield any immediate tangible outcome. Nonetheless, the visit gave me an opportunity to further discuss some of my earlier recommendations and, in particular, to exchange views on the current preparations for the planned constitutional referendum in May and for "multi-party democratic elections" by 2010. I believe that those discussions helped to foster a greater understanding of how the Government of Myanmar could work further with the good offices of the Secretary-General. In that context, I would like to brief the Council on the topics of those discussions.

First, with regard to the constitution-making process and the planned referendum and elections, I am pleased to have been able to place on record with the Government Authoritative Spokesperson's Team, the Referendum Convening Commission and the Constitution Drafting Committee the views and concerns of the United Nations, as well as specific suggestions for enhancing the credibility of the constitutional and electoral process. These included our offer of technical assistance, in accordance with the good offices mandate of the Secretary-General on Myanmar, and our suggestion that the authorities consider independent monitoring of the process.

In that connection, I left with my interlocutors a list of countries that have voluntarily requested technical assistance for their electoral processes. As a matter of fact, 57 countries did so between 2003 and 2005, and 50 have actually benefited from the extension of such assistance from the United Nations. I also left questions and observations prepared by our experts regarding the conduct of the constitution-making process, the referendum and the elections, which I hope they will find useful with a view to enhancing the credibility and inclusiveness of the process. My discussion with the Referendum Convening Commission was published in full in newspapers the next morning.

I was given repeated assurances on previous visits, including at the highest level of Myanmar's leadership, that all political forces in Myanmar will be allowed to freely participate in the referendum and the election. The Government further reiterated that the draft constitution was completed based on the principles adopted earlier by the broadly inclusive process of the National Convention and that, based on the precedents of the 1947 and 1974 constitutions, it has sufficient experience to organize and conduct a referendum and elections.

In this regard, I was given a first published copy of the draft constitution — unfortunately for me, it was in Burmese, but I am sure that we will get an English version soon — a copy of the referendum law in English and a sample of the referendum ballot paper. I encouraged the authorities to take further steps to ensure that the credibility of the process is enhanced.

Such steps should include early and broad dissemination of information, including the referendum rules and regulations, in addition to the text of the constitution and the referendum law. I felt that the better the educated voters are and the more public space there is for open debate on the draft constitution, the more confidence the process will generate from all political actors and the public at large, and the more the process will be perceived as credible, both internally and to the outside world.

In the socio-economic area, the recommendation of the United Nations to establish a broad-based National Economic Forum was discussed with the Minister of National Planning and Development and the Minister of Health. In their view, sanctions are the primary cause of the socio-economic problems in Myanmar and the central obstacle to the country's development.

Technically, therefore, they consider the utility of the proposed forum or similar proposals as limited since, in their view, such vehicles would only produce a distorted diagnosis for Myanmar. Nonetheless, in subsequent discussions, the Government expressed interest in finding areas of convergence on this issue with a view to addressing its concerns as well as the challenges facing the country. To this end, the United Nations stands ready to continue to work together with its Myanmar partners to develop existing and new ideas.

With regard to the dialogue between the Government and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, I regard the fact that I was granted a second meeting with her as an indication that the Government remains interested in maintaining this channel of communication and as a sign of willingness on the part of the authorities in recognizing the value of the role of the United Nations in helping to facilitate substantive dialogue.

It is also important to recognize the steps the Government has taken in appointing a minister for liaison with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and in the several meetings they have held so far. On her part, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi has already signalled a her willingness to cooperate with the Government in the interest of the nation. She continues to expect the United Nations, through the good offices mission, to help facilitate a substantive and time-bound dialogue to that end.

The role of the United Nations good offices in this regard therefore appears relevant, or is considered relevant to both sides. With a view to advancing the ongoing discussion between them, I have proposed that the Government consider raising the level of the interlocutor on its side, and I have stressed that no dialogue can be complete unless Daw Aung San Suu Kyi is released and treated as a partner in dialogue.

In my meetings with her, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi asked me to report that she is in good health and in good spirits.

On balance, the process of engagement and dialogue continues between the United Nations and the Government of Myanmar. In addition to the positive steps taken in the wake of the September crisis, the Government's ongoing cooperation with the International Labour Organization (ILO), which on 26 February resulted in a one-year extension of the supplementary understanding of between Myanmar and the ILO to address complaints of forced labour and the fact that it has agreed to receive delegations from the International Committee of the Red Cross and the European Union can be seen as further evidence of Myanmar's readiness to continue the engagement with the United Nations and the international community.

In this context, and based on my last exchange with the Authoritative Government Spokesman's Team and messages conveyed privately, I have reason to believe that the Government attaches importance to the mission just concluded and continues to see value in the good offices of the Secretary-General as offering the best prospect for further cooperation through mutual trust and confidence and constructive suggestions. This position was again reiterated in the letter dated yesterday from the Permanent Representative of Myanmar addressed to me.

This was my third visit to Myanmar since my appointment as Special Advisor — not Special Envoy — to the Secretary-General less than a year ago. This latest mission confirms that the principles of engagement that have guided our efforts so far and that have been broadly endorsed, including by members of this Council, remain as relevant as ever.

As a process, the Secretary-General's good offices are inevitably subject to ups and downs. That is why, despite the lack of immediate, tangible results, this latest visit should be assessed within the broader context of our efforts over the past two years. Only two years ago, high-level dialogue between the United Nations and Myanmar was non-existent. Similarly, only six months ago, there was no mechanism for promoting dialogue between the Government and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi.

Furthermore, by the time the Secretary-General's good offices role resumed in 2006, Myanmar was still at the first step of its road map. Since then, the National Convention has laid down the principles to be enshrined in a new draft constitution. Subsequently, a Constitution Drafting Committee was established, which completed the task of drafting the draft constitution.

On 9 February, for the first time, the Government announced a timeline for the implementation of its road map. A nationwide referendum on the draft constitution will be held in May and will be the fourth step in the road map, followed upon ratification by multi-party democratic elections in 2010, the fifth step. This would be the first general election in twenty years.

With the Government committed to implementing its road map, the United Nations has consistently argued that a credible and inclusive process can and should offer realistic prospects for advancing the shared objectives of sustainable peace, national reconciliation, democracy and respect for human rights in Myanmar. That is why it is in Myanmar's interest to ensure that the upcoming referendum and elections are as credible and inclusive as possible, in accordance with international norms and standards. And that is why it is incumbent on all sides to be forward-looking and make the most of the opportunities before them by demonstrating maximum flexibility, to make the process work in the interest of all the people of Myanmar.

But while a referendum and elections are milestones in any transition to civilian and democratic rule, they are not ends in themselves. It is important in

this regard to remember that Myanmar is a country that has experienced nearly sixty years of armed conflict between the Government and multiple armed opponents, that there remain more than two dozen armed groups in the country and that the Government and the large majority of armed groups have agreed to ceasefires in the past fifteen years.

In order to succeed, any formal process requires political conditions that are conducive to ensuring broad and free participation in the country's transition, so that all can become stakeholders in the future of their country. That is why it is in Myanmar's interest for the Government and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, as well as other relevant parties, to be able to engage without delay in a substantive and time-bound dialogue, so that the foundations for achieving inclusive national reconciliation and democracy can be laid today. That is also why it is in the interest of Myanmar to develop now the instruments for sustainable development, without which there can be no durable peace and stability.

The United Nations recognizes that, ultimately, the Government and people of Myanmar are responsible for their country's future. How it chooses to exercise its sovereignty — either in isolation from or in partnership with the international community — is therefore up to Myanmar.

The United Nations, through the good offices role of the Secretary-General and with the support of the international community, will continue to seek to work as partners with the Government and people of Myanmar. I therefore look forward to our continued dialogue and engagement with a view to strengthening our cooperation through tangible results.

Over the past two years, the unique comparative advantages of the Secretary-General's good offices have been demonstrated in various ways. The United Nations remains the only international actor to maintain face-to-face dialogue with Myanmar's leaders on the need for further efforts towards national reconciliation, democracy and human rights. The United Nations is the only outsider to maintain access to both the Government and Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and to act as a go-between between the two. The United Nations is Myanmar's preferred interlocutor for engaging with the international community and the region. That is why now is the time for the international community as a whole to remain united in support of the Secretary-General's good offices, in order to ensure that Myanmar's interests and concerns are addressed in a way that is both credible to its own people and acceptable to the international community.

In pursuing the good offices role on behalf of the Secretary-General, I consider it my underlying responsibility to press the Myanmar authorities on the critical and very thorny issues. I therefore approach every encounter with the Myanmar authorities with one goal in mind, namely, to sustain the process we have begun: to continue to prod the Myanmar authorities to constructively engage the domestic political interests, notably the opposition, with a view to moving the political process forward; and to encourage them to respond in a tangible manner and in ways that the international community will deem meaningful and progressive towards the realization of the objectives that we all share. Those are — and it needs to be repeated — a peaceful, prosperous and democratic Myanmar with full respect for the human rights of its people.

Finally, encouraging the Myanmar authorities to reverse a policy mind-set that has lasted this long can be challenging, but it is imperative that we continue to do so with persistence and patience — but with legitimate expectations of tangible results from the process of engagement.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I thank Mr. Gambari for his briefing.

I now give the floor to the representative of Myanmar.

Mr. Swe (Myanmar): I wish to thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to make a statement at this briefing.

I would also like to thank Under-Secretary-General Gambari for his briefing on the details of his recent visit to Myanmar. The Secretary-General's good offices role — mandated by the General Assembly — has been ably implemented by Ambassador Gambari. The task that he is undertaking is by no means an easy one. That is because of the complex nature of the challenges facing Myanmar in trying to transform the country into a democratic society while at the same time forging national reconciliation and maintaining national unity. I therefore wish to express my appreciation and admiration to Ambassador Gambari

for the principled manner in which he is implementing the good offices mandate with regard to Myanmar.

The good offices role of the Secretary-General that has been mandated by the General Assembly has been described by Ambassador Gambari as a process and not an event. He has also stressed that the process must bring about tangible results.

To see where this process is right now, one must look at the process when it began. In 2003, Myanmar set for itself a seven-step political road map to democracy. When Ambassador Gambari started the good offices role, we were still at the first step of our road map. Since then, the National Convention has successfully laid down the fundamental principles to be enshrined in a new constitution. Subsequently, a commission to draft the State constitution was established. On 19 February, it successfully completed its task of drafting a new constitution. A nationwide referendum on the draft constitution — the fourth step of the road map — will be held in May. Upon ratification, multiparty elections — the fifth step — will be held in 2010.

In the course of his good offices efforts, many of the things that Ambassador Gambari discussed with the Government have come to fruition. After the tragic event of September, the Government lifted the curfew and withdrew the presence of the military from public areas in major cities, where they had previously been stationed. Some 2,600 persons, including 780 monks, have been released from detention. The National Convention was successfully concluded, with 8,552 prisoners released to mark that historic occasion. Dialogue and cooperation with the International Labour Organization (ILO) continued, and the Government and the ILO recently concluded the extension of the supplementary understanding between them. Minister U Aung Kyi has been appointed as Minister for Relations with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, and they have met several times. Those are indeed positive and concrete developments, made possible by the trust and confidence that Ambassador Gambari enjoys.

During his recent visit, Ambassador Gambari had the opportunity to meet twice with the plenipotentiary spokesperson team representing the State Peace and Development Council, headed by the Minister for Information. Ambassador Gambari has also had the opportunity to meet with members of the commission charged with drafting the State constitution and with the commission for the holding of the referendum, as well as with political parties — including the National League for Democracy (NLD) — and the International Committee of the Red Cross. As per his request, we made arrangements for him to meet twice with Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and extended his visit to Myanmar.

Ambassador Gambari's visit provided him with the opportunity to have extensive discussions with our authorities. Those discussions are very useful because we are able to understand each other and draw parameters for cooperation with the United Nations. I am also gratified that many of our neighbours, who see the situation as it really is, have acknowledged the progress made in this recent visit. I am also thankful to the Secretary-General for acknowledging that "there was some progress".

The Secretary-General's good offices role is mandated by the General Assembly. Yesterday, after meeting with Ambassador Gambari, the President of the General Assembly issued a statement that he was

> "encouraged by the fact that the Special Envoy was able to meet with key figures, including pro-democracy leader and Nobel laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, as well as with the Referendum Convening Commission and the Constitution Drafting Committee".

We take heart from that statement.

During Ambassador Gambari's visit, we were able to explain to him the inclusive nature of the National Convention process, which laid down the fundamental principles to be enshrined in the draft constitution. In fact, the National Convention was set up by the meeting attended by all political parties. The three important chapters of the fundamental principles were drawn up and agreed to by the National League for Democracy when it was part of the National Convention. When we reconvened the National Convention in 2004, the NLD was again invited. However, it declined the invitation at the last minute.

The National Convention is comprised of some 1,080 delegates, out of which 635 are from the ethnic nationalities. It also included representatives of the political parties and representatives of the 17 insurgent groups that have returned to the legal fold. Myanmar had to face over 40 years of insurgency because of the weakness in the 1947 Constitution. Some ethnic

nationalities had reservations regarding the provisions in that Constitution. Therefore, the inclusion of representatives of the ethnic nationalities and the former insurgent groups in the National Convention, and their acceptance of the fundamental principles, are of the utmost importance. They also attest to the inclusive nature of the National Convention process.

Under the fundamental principles adopted by the National Convention, in addition to the existing seven states and seven divisions, the ethnic nationalities with sizeable populations will be allowed to form themselves into self-administered zones, in fulfilment of the one of their most important aspirations. The boundaries of the existing states and the new self-administered zones have also been agreed to by the representatives to the National Convention. That was no easy task. The constitution drafting commission has completed that task.

The draft Constitution, which contains all these provisions as well as qualifications for taking part in the elections, will be put to a nationwide referendum in May. During its meeting with Ambassador Gambari, the spokesperson team assured him that the referendum will be free and fair. In the referendum, as well as in the elections, everyone — those who support the Government and those who oppose its policies — will be allowed to participate on equal terms.

Given the complexity of the challenges that Myanmar faces, the Government has come a long way and has made significant strides in our seven-step political road map. Myanmar has been cooperating, and will continue to cooperate, with the United Nations. After all, cooperation with the United Nations is a cornerstone of Myanmar's foreign policy. Here I can do no better than to echo what the leader of the plenipotentiary spokesperson team said to Ambassador Gambari on 10 March, when he thanked the Ambassador for his constructive advice and expressed our support and continued willingness to cooperate with the good offices role of the Secretary-General mandated by the General Assembly.

May I conclude by stressing once again that Myanmar is not a threat to international peace and security. That has been attested to by all of Myanmar's neighbours. The country is making significant strides in its national reconciliation and democratization process. No Security Council action is warranted with regard to Myanmar.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I thank the representative of Myanmar for his statement.

There are no other speakers on my list. In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I should now like to invite Council members to informal consultations to continue our discussions on the subject.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.5855

Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5855th meeting

Wednesday, 19 March 2008, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Churkin	(Russian Federation)
Members:	Belgium	Mr. Verbeke
	Burkina Faso	Mr. Kafando
	China	Mr. Liu Zhenmin
	Costa Rica	Mr. Urbina
	Croatia	Mr. Jurica
	France	Mr. Ripert
	Indonesia	Mr. Natalegawa
	Italy	Mr. Spatafora
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Mr. Ettalhi
	Panama	Mr. Arias
	South Africa	Mr. Kumalo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir John Sawers
	United States of America	Mr. Wolff
	Viet Nam	Mr. Le Luong Minh

Agenda

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A.

08-27612 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Cuba, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Japan, Mexico, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in which they request to be invited to participate in the consideration of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the consideration without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, the aforementioned representatives took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I shall take it that the Security Council agrees to extend an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure to the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, Mr. Mike Smith.

It is so decided.

I invite Mr. Smith to take a seat at the Council table.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/2008/80, which contains the text of a letter dated 7 February 2008 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, addressed to the President of the Security Council.

At this meeting, the Security Council will hear a briefing by the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate, Mr. Mike Smith. I now give him the floor.

Mr. Smith: It is a great pleasure and an honour to have been invited to make this statement before the Security Council. It gives me the opportunity, early in my tenure as Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), to express my appreciation for the confidence and trust that you, the members of the Council, have shown in me, in approving my appointment to this position.

On 10 December 2007, the Council adopted resolution 1787 (2007), which extended the mandate of CTED until 31 March 2008 and which requested me, in consultation with Council members, to recommend changes to the organizational plan of the Executive Directorate. I duly carried out that review of the Directorate's organization and methods of work, consulting with all the members of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, the wider United Nations membership, CTED staff, other relevant United Nations agencies and experts outside the system.

I presented a revised version of the organizational plan to the Committee on 24 January 2008, where it was subsequently endorsed and forwarded to the Security Council. It is now before the Council in document S/2008/80, dated 8 February 2008.

When the Council adopted resolution 1373 (2001) on 28 September 2001, following the heinous attack on the World Trade Center in this city two weeks earlier, it was underlining for the whole world the threat that terrorism poses to us all. It also set out in that resolution the measures that all countries needed to take to combat that threat, including criminalizing terrorist acts, denying terrorists safe haven and financial resources, preventing terrorists from crossing borders and increasing cooperation with each other in order to prevent terrorist attacks and bring perpetrators to justice. All of those elements of resolution 1373 (2001) remain critical to addressing that threat and that resolution remains as relevant today as it was six and a half years ago.

At the same time, it is worth noting that considerable progress has been made. Most countries in the world have now criminalized terrorism. We have seen hundreds of new ratifications of the key counter-terrorism conventions and protocols, and there has

been an almost unprecedented level of international exchange of information and cooperation among relevant agencies across borders, with the purpose of disrupting planned terrorist attacks and enabling the arrest and prosecution of those engaged in terrorism.

Given those developments, the need today is less to ensure that countries understand the seriousness of the challenge and more to ensure that they have the capacity and the expertise to implement the counter-terrorism measures set out in resolution 1373 (2001). To put it another way, these days the Counter-Terrorism Committee tends to spend less time establishing whether countries have put in place appropriate legislation and counter-terrorism machinery, and more time evaluating how effective their border control arrangements, their counter-terrorism coordination machinery and their law enforcement capabilities are. In this process, we have become more aware of the capacity, resource and infrastructural constraints that are impeding full implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) in particular countries and regions.

The general progress made in the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) was part of the background for my review of CTED's organizational plan. At the same time, that review was very much informed by three specific priorities that were repeatedly raised with me in the course of my consultations with members of the Council and the wider United Nations membership. The first of these is the consistency of our judgements across various countries and regions — something that is critical to the credibility of all our work. The second is facilitation of technical assistance. If we are to add real value to countries' counter-terrorism efforts, we need to be able to find solutions to the vulnerabilities that we identify. And the third is communication. There is clearly a need to explain, particularly to the wider United Nations membership, what we do and how we can help countries in their efforts to confront terrorism.

Let me say a little about the specific proposals in the revised organizational plan and how they address those concerns. The principal organizational change to CTED is the establishment, within the Assessment and Technical Assistance Office, of five cross-cutting functional groups in the areas of, respectively, technical assistance; terrorist financing; border control, arms trafficking and law enforcement; general legal issues; and issues raised by resolution 1624 (2005), as well as the human rights aspects of counter-terrorism. Those groups have been meeting regularly since their establishment and are already producing useful revisions of strategy, in the case of the technical assistance group, and revised criteria for harmonizing technical judgements about the implementation of particular elements of resolution 1373 (2001), in the case of the other groups.

Additionally, two smaller units have been created: one, a quality control unit to review documents before they leave the Executive Directorate and to ensure that they are consistent in style and format; and the other, a communications and outreach unit to develop more proactive communications strategies. Both of those units have been working actively over the past few weeks and are having a positive impact on the work of the Directorate.

As regards our methods of work, the revised organizational plan suggests several innovations. First, it proposes a more flexible approach to visits to countries, to allow for more focused visits tailored to the needs and situation of the country concerned. Secondly, it proposes a more comprehensive engagement with donors, the better to match their capabilities and programmes with the vulnerabilities identified in our dialogue with countries. Thirdly, it suggests that CTED become more actively involved in the work of the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force — a proposal that simply recognizes that implementing the requirements of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) implements, at the same time, most part of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Finally, it suggests greater effort to strengthen collaboration and cooperation with the experts of the Security Council Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1540 (2004). It also highlights the usefulness of strengthened relations with international, regional and subregional organizations.

I am confident that implementing those changes in the structure and work of CTED will improve the credibility and usefulness of our work in future.

Let me now mention two particularly significant pieces of work on which we are currently engaged. First, we are close to finalizing the 192 Preliminary Implementation Assessments — or PIAs — one for every Member of the United Nations. This is a new and innovative tool that will greatly enhance our dialogue

with Member States on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). Some 160 of these have already been adopted by the Committee and sent to the capitals of the States concerned.

Secondly, we are putting the finishing touches to a revision of "Survey of the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001)" — a document in which, I know, the Committee and this Council have taken considerable interest. That survey looks at how countries in all regions and subregions across the globe are proceeding in their counter-terrorism efforts generally, where they are encountering difficulties and what gaps and vulnerabilities remain to be addressed in particular regions. I am hopeful that members will find it a valuable diagnostic tool to inform consideration of what next steps should be taken to address the ongoing threat of global terrorism.

The appalling bombing of the United Nations offices in Algiers on 11 December 2007 serves as a sober reminder that, notwithstanding the positive efforts we have collectively made, terrorism continues to be a serious threat to us all, and it continues to evolve and to manifest itself in new and dangerous ways. Member States have to do more to address this threat, and we, the United Nations, have to do a better job to help them in that endeavour. It is my hope that, with the renewal of CTED's mandate and the implementation of the proposals set out in the revised organizational plan, the Directorate will be able to assist the Security Council, through the Counter-Terrorism Committee, to make an appropriate contribution to this collective global effort.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I thank Mr. Smith for his briefing.

In accordance with the understanding reached among Council members, I wish to remind all speakers to limit their statements to no more than five minutes in order to enable the Council to carry out its work expeditiously. Delegations with lengthy statements are kindly requested to circulate the texts in writing and to deliver a condensed version when speaking in the Chamber.

Sir John Sawers (United Kingdom): It is a particular pleasure to be the first member of the Council to give a very warm welcome to Mr. Smith in his new job. Those of us who have followed the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) have seen that, in the few months that he has been in that role, he has already given a real boost to the sense of direction and purpose of the Directorate. I believe that, with the combination of him in that role and Ambassador Jurica as Chairman of the Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee, there is a new vitality in our work on counter-terrorism.

We in the United Kingdom certainly believe that the United Nations and the Security Council have a very important role to play in the fight against terrorism. The threat of terrorism continues to face a significant number of United Nations Member States directly, day in and day out. The consequences of terrorism reach all of us. Increasingly and tragically, they seek to strike at the United Nations itself. I would like to place on record once again the United Kingdom's utter condemnation of the attack on the United Nations in Algiers last December and our deep condolences to the victims and their families.

We must succeed in our joint endeavour to stop the criminals and murderers from perpetrating terrorist acts. The terrorist threat is complex and requires a multidimensional response. It will require work across the United Nations system, underpinned by genuine coordination. I believe that Mr. Smith's report helped to bring all of that out. We have to focus on interventions that make a visible difference. We will know that we have succeeded when we see an improvement in Member States' preparedness to tackle terrorism. Some of that will come from capacity-building; we must make sure that it leads to a genuine increase in countries' capabilities. That includes a wide range of challenges, from investigation and disruption of terrorist networks to blocking terrorist financing; from border security to protecting transports and other critical infrastructure.

It is against that backdrop that the appointment of Mr. Smith and his briefing of this Council is so welcome. We particularly welcome the focus he put on three things: first, looking internally at CTED processes to improve their consistency and to get the most out of the range of expertise in the Directorate; secondly, looking outside CTED to consult widely on its role and how it can best work with all Member States, including through international and regional organizations; and, thirdly, considering new priorities in the work of CTED.

I think the briefing that Mr. Smith has just given us has amply demonstrated the focus that he has brought on all three of these issues, and I warmly endorse the recommendations he has put forward.

In the areas of renewed emphasis for CTED, we welcome, in particular, the focus on increased work with donors, for which we stand ready to do our part. We welcome the commitment to increase cooperation with other parts of the United Nations. This should include strengthening work with the 1267 (1999) monitoring team and the 1540 (2004) Committee experts, for which this Council has called for some time. Equally important, we welcome their commitment to play their full part in the work of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force.

The continued commitment to take forward work on incitement to terrorism and dealing with that problem within the context of resolution 1624 (2005) is also particularly important. In view of the threat we see emerging today, attacking radicalization and recruitment is essential, especially by challenging the ideology of violent extremism and helping to support vulnerable communities.

We look forward to the report of the Counter-Terrorism Committee on the implementation of the counter-terrorism obligations by States under resolution 1373 (2001) to which Mr. Smith referred. We attach importance to having a global picture of achievements and gaps in order for the Council to be able to guide the priorities of the Committee in the year ahead. We think that such an analysis will be important at the start of each year.

I would like to close by saying that under the able leadership of Ambassador Jurica and Mr. Smith at CTED, this is a promising time for the work of the Council on counter-terrorism issues. The United Kingdom would welcome sustained Council involvement in counter-terrorism, and we stand ready to do our part.

Mr. Kafando (Burkina Faso) (*spoke in French*): Our present debate within the framework of the renewal of the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) of the Security Council. It provides my delegation with the opportunity to congratulate Mr. Mike Smith, not only on his briefing, but also on his assumption of the post of Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate, something we have not yet had an opportunity to do. Aware of the heavy burden of responsibility and the complexity of the task facing him, we would like to assure him of our full support.

It is with great interest that we have followed the intensive consultations he has engaged in, consultations which have allowed him to elaborate and submit to the Committee a new organizational plan of work for CTED, in conformity with paragraph 2 of resolution 1787 (2007).

My delegation is satisfied that, in the new proposals of the Executive Director, the issue of appropriate technical assistance tailored to the needs of the recipient countries was considered a priority. The fight against terrorism is our joint responsibility, and only international solidarity and cooperation will enable us to deal with this scourge effectively.

We also believe that visits to Member States should be better organized, more flexible and less burdensome. This would allow us to engage in exhaustive exchanges while focusing on the main concerns of States visited. These types of visits should be given priority over the systematic approach of comprehensive assessments.

This is an opportunity to mention that CTED and its Executive Director should interact more closely with all Member States of the United Nations. This is all the more important as only collective, concerted efforts will enable us to eradicate the threat posed by terrorism. A number of proposals have been presented, and we especially endorse the concept of "public briefings" by CTED.

The need for greater coordination in our efforts to fight terrorism is an ongoing concern of the United Nations and the international community as a whole. Therefore, while we encourage initiatives that foster the exchange of information and cooperation among the three Security Council committees, namely, 1267 (1999), 1373 (2001) and 1540 (2004), we remain convinced that, in this field, which is of interest to all, the actions of the Council — which we would like to be more transparent — should be united with those of the General Assembly in order to involve all the Member States of this Organization.

The United Nations cannot continue to ask Member States to engage in concerted action against terrorism while it itself engages in disparate actions. This is all the more so as the various Security Council

resolutions in this field, as well as those of the General Assembly, are addressed to all Member States of the Organization without any exceptions.

The United Nations should also cooperate closely with regional and subregional organizations, which have, quite clearly, a better understanding of the regional and subregional factors and influences that need to be taken into account if we wish to fight terrorism more effectively.

Finally, my delegation of course endorses the renewal of the mandate of CTED, with the certainty that the resolution to be adopted will take into account all concerns, especially respect for human rights.

Mr. Ripert (France) (*spoke in French*): I would like to thank the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate for his briefing, the first he has given to the Council. I would also like to commend the Permanent Representative of Croatia, who from now on will be chairing the work of the Committee.

France notes with appreciation the efforts put forth by Mr. Smith at the helm of CTED since his arrival in November. We reaffirm our full support for him in his mission. The Security Council can only endorse the guidelines that he outlined to us in his briefing, guidelines that will be included in the draft resolution which I hope will be adopted tomorrow.

The Executive Directorate plays a central role in supporting and advising the Committee. Established by the Security Council in the weeks following the heinous attacks of 11 September 2001, the Committee received an ambitious and unprecedented mandate aimed at raising to a higher level the anti-terrorism measures adopted by United Nations Member States. In order to do this, the Committee, from the outset, developed a cooperative approach, based on encouragement and assistance to Member States to enable them to meet their obligations under resolution 1373 (2001).

The report on the proposals by Mr. Smith conveyed to us by the Committee identifies the key issues to be addressed in order to ensure that the work of the Executive Directorate fully meets our expectations. I will touch only on a few issues to which we attach priority. Field visits are an indispensable tool in order to enhance dialogue with Member States, performance evaluation and the identification of needs. Since 2004, with their agreement, 11 countries have been visited. An in-depth dialogue has begun concerning their arrangements. This approach is starting to bear fruit.

In order to ensure that these visits meet their objectives, it is crucial, as was stated by the Ambassador of Burkina Faso, that they be prepared with the greatest care with account being taken of country specificities and, as was also said earlier, the specificities of each region and subregion. Furthermore, each visit should benefit from an attentive follow-up. As was also stated, we need too to take into account the capabilities and potential of regional and subregional organizations. We must exploit to the full this direct dialogue with the Member States' administrations.

That same logic has led the Committee to replace its reports and exchanges of letters with preliminary implementation assessments, which provide Member States with a comprehensive and detailed analysis of their level of compliance with resolution 1373 (2001). More than 100 such assessments have been approved by the Committee and conveyed to the Member States concerned. They should make possible the establishment of an open and specific dialogue on technical and political issues.

In addition, on the request of the Security Council, the Executive Directorate has begun a global assessment of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) so as to have a comprehensive overview at its disposal. That overview will make it possible for the Committee to reach conclusions and provide recommendations to the Security Council. We attach special importance to the speedy finalization of that document.

Technical assistance is another crucial area of Committee efforts. In order to facilitate the provision of technical assistance in accordance with resolution 1535 (2004), the Executive Directorate must improve its working methods and tools in order to focus its efforts vis-à-vis donors and recipient States. We welcome the fact that Mr. Smith has made that one of his priorities as the head of the Executive Directorate. He can rest assured that all European Union (EU) partners will support him in that undertaking.

Finally, I would like to add that, given its mandate and activities, the Executive Directorate must play its full role in the streamlining efforts under way

to ensure greater coherence of the efforts of the United Nations to combat terrorism. The Executive Directorate must therefore participate actively in the task force established by the Secretary-General to promote the active and coordinated implementation of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which was adopted in September 2006. That will undoubtedly be one of the key priorities of France's upcoming presidency of the EU, following up on the efforts of the Slovenian presidency.

The Committee is a unique body that has been given a very large monitoring mandate under a resolution that addressees all aspects of the fight against terrorism. Its role is well-acknowledged. However, its efforts have also led to criticism and apprehension. In order to dispel those doubts, more should be done explain its activities. An outreach effort should be started in that regard. In that connection, I would like to support what was said earlier by my colleague and friend, Michel Kafando. Communication is one of the elements necessary to ensuring that everyone endorses and supports a fight that is, by definition, a global threat that requires a correspondingly global and collective response. A sense of ownership of what the Committee is doing is key for the success of its efforts.

In order that it can successfully achieve its mandate, the Committee needs an active Executive Directorate that provides proposals and documents for consideration, that analyses reports and situations in an in-depth manner so as to implement quickly and effectively the guidelines it has been given. It is clear that the Executive Directorate must continue its efforts in order to achieve those goals. Mr. Mike Smith's words reassure us that that is indeed his intention and that the Executive Directorate is on the right track. We remain watchful and have great expectations, for our collective success will depend upon his success in combating terrorism.

Mr. Jurica (Croatia): At the outset, I would like to thank Mr. Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), for his comprehensive and informative briefing on CTED's revised organizational plan.

Furthermore, Croatia is pleased to be a sponsor of the draft resolution to be adopted on the renewal of CTED's mandate until 31 December 2010.

Terrorism is a serious threat to international peace and security, as it attempts to undermine the core values of the modern democratic world. Terrorism poses a serious challenge to our security, to the basic principles of democratic societies and to the rights and freedoms of our citizens. Terrorist acts are criminal in nature and cannot be justified under any circumstances. We appreciate the efforts being made in the global struggle against terrorism.

Since the beginning of this year, Croatia has had the privilege and responsibility of chairing the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), which was established in the immediate aftermath of the devastating terrorist attacks against not only the United States but the entire democratic world on 11 September 2001. The mandate of the Committee is to monitor the implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005), to provide advice to Member States regarding the implementation of their provisions and to help States receive the necessary technical assistance to reinforce their counter-terrorism measures and initiatives. Today's meeting therefore has particular significance, as the new draft resolution will not only chart the way forward for CTED, but also outline the basic parameters for the Committee's activities in the future.

In that respect, I would like to emphasize that CTED plays a crucial supporting role in fulfilling the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee. I would like to express my gratitude for the excellent cooperation we have received so far from the Executive Director and his team. In the coming months, the Committee should finalize the process of adopting the remaining preliminary implementation assessments, so that ultimately every Member State of the United Nations receives a standardized evaluation of its counter-terrorism performance. We believe that, by working in a collaborative manner, the Committee and CTED could increase the effectiveness of this important subsidiary body and reinvigorate the operations of the Security Council in this area.

The Croatian delegation welcomes the proposal in the revised organizational plan to develop a comprehensive strategy to engage with donors who are active in the counter-terrorism field, as well as to intensify a tailored dialogue with recipient countries with a view to identifying their counter-terrorism needs. Facilitating technical assistance is one of the most efficient ways of improving counter-terrorism

capacity. It is also instrumental in raising the visibility of the Security Council's engagement in this area.

Terrorism is a common threat that can be successfully suppressed only by working together. We support the call for enhanced cooperation with international, regional and subregional organizations, but we also reiterate the need for regular experience- and expertise-sharing with the relevant counter-terrorism experts. In that context, let me inform the Council that my country is active in the various international counter-terrorism arrangements, and a Croatian representative is currently chairing the Council of Europe's Committee of Experts on Terrorism.

As the Counter-Terrorism Committee moves towards its seventh anniversary, we must acknowledge that the struggle against international terrorism is still ongoing. We have achieved commendable results, especially in the areas of increased cooperation and information-sharing. But terrorist groups are finding ways to adjust and to use more advanced methods in recruiting new members and in carrying out their terrorist acts. The responsibility of the Security Council and the Committee is to make sure everyone remains vigilant in addressing this threat. But it is also to explain what ideas and values we stand for and what results have been achieved so far.

Mr. Verbeke (Belgium) (*spoke in French*): A few days ago, the European Union (EU) paid tribute to the memory of the victims of terrorism. Four years following the Madrid attacks, the date of 11 March has become a day of remembrance in Europe for all the victims of terrorism, whose numbers are unfortunately continuing to increase. In that regard, given that an attack can take place anywhere and at any time, concerted action by the international community is of crucial importance. The legitimacy of the United Nations in this area gives it an essential and unique role to play.

First of all, I should like to express my gratitude to Assistant Secretary-General Mike Smith for his very clear, sober and effective presentation. I would like once again to reiterate to him the full support of Belgium. The revised organizational plan that he has just presented, which was endorsed by the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) last month, is the result of the broad consultations he has held since he took up his functions as the head of the Executive Directorate.

Belgium welcomes the directions decided on, which favour a more proactive communication and a more frequent dialogue with Member States. Those are measures that will without a doubt contribute to enhancing support for the Committee support and for the Executive Directorate itself.

My delegation associates itself fully with the statement that will be made by the Permanent Representative of Slovenia on behalf of the European Union, and I would like to add a few additional comments.

The United Nations strives to fight against terrorism in a global and holistic way, as reflected in its Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. The implementation of Security Council resolutions in the fight against terrorism, which include, first and foremost, resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005), are an especially important facet of Member States' commitment in this field — a commitment that the Committee must monitor and encourage.

That implementation requires that States show determination, but it also requires resources and expertise that they do not always have. Strengthening the role of the Executive Directorate as facilitator for the provision of technical assistance, including by means of regular dialogue with other international, regional and subregional partners, is of course a priority.

Cohesiveness, coordination and complementarity in the actions of the various United Nations bodies are a guarantee of heightened efficiency. In this context, Belgium welcomes the strengthening of cooperation between the various Security Council committees that deal with counter-terrorism. It also welcomes the elevated commitment of CTED to the work of the task force established within the framework of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

The fight against terrorism will only be genuinely effective in the long term if it takes root in legitimacy, the respect of human rights and the respect of fundamental rights. This is the yardstick against which the results of our work will be judged.

In this context, Belgium welcomes the more systematic integration and incorporation of this dimension in the Committee's and Executive Directorate's work, and endorses a continuation of dialogue between the CTC and United Nations bodies

responsible for the protection of human rights, including the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism.

My delegation wishes to see all the aforementioned elements reflected in the draft resolution that will be submitted for our Council's consideration tomorrow to renew CTED's mandate. Through the adoption of such a text, the potential for action of the Committee and the Executive Directorate will be even further strengthened and diversified so that it can discharge its very important mandate.

Mr. McBride (United States of America): We welcome Mr. Michael Smith, the new Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), and thank him for his briefing. Mr. Smith is off to an energetic and productive start, and we value his contributions and support his recommendations on how best to advance the work of CTED.

We are also pleased to welcome the new Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and Permanent Representative of Croatia, Ambassador Jurica. In his short time in the Chair, Ambassador Jurica has already proved to be an effective leader.

The United States thanks Mr. Smith for responding so quickly and efficiently to the Council's request in resolution 1787 (2007) that he submit any changes to CTED's organizational plan that he considers to be appropriate. The paper, which outlines the proposed changes to the Executive Directorate's method of work and organizational plan, was produced following thoughtful and broad-based consultations with United Nations Member States.

The organizational plan, endorsed by the Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee, clearly sets forth CTED's priorities, including active participation in the counter-terrorism implementation task force, established to assist Member States in their implementation of the Global Strategy. It is an ambitious but realistic plan to move CTED's operations forward. By doing so, this would enhance both the CTC's and Security Council's efforts to promote States' implementation of resolution 1373 (2001).

Counter-terrorism is our common effort. This is evident in the goals of the General Assembly's Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. It is equally apparent in the priorities and activities of CTED, as exemplified by the high priority that CTED and the Council place on strengthening the facilitation of technical assistance aimed at increasing the capabilities of Member States in the fight against terrorism and ensuring that the provision of assistance is adjusted to each country's own needs.

In addition to technical assistance, Mr. Smith has also highlighted two other specific priorities: consistency and communications. These three elements: consistency, which is the responsibility of a new quality control unit; technical assistance; and enhanced communication with all United Nations Members are the pillars supporting CTED's work. We commend Mr. Smith for his outreach to the wider United Nations membership. It is through those consultations that the three priorities were reaffirmed.

We also applaud the proposed modifications to CTED's working methods. They reflect a more focused and refined approach to its work, which is aimed at greater efficiency and productivity. In the same vein, revisions of the operational structure reflect a plan to make the best possible use of personnel resources. The United States views these innovations positively and supports their underlying objectives. My Government is hopeful that this CTED mandate renewal, under Mr. Smith's leadership as Executive Director and with a revised organizational plan, will serve as a new beginning and will build on the foundation laid during the course of the prior mandate. This, in turn, will strengthen the CTC. We will give Mr. Smith and the CTED staff our full support in this endeavour.

Mr. Spatafora (Italy): I join others in extending a very warm welcome to Mr. Smith, the Executive Director of Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), and in expressing our very strong appreciation for his briefing, which was very comprehensive, crystal clear and quite focused. His statement, together with his suggested organizational plan for the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), which we strongly support, very clearly sets out the direction for the way forward.

Italy aligns itself with the statement that Slovenia will soon make on behalf of the European Union, and recognizes the importance of today's debate, which

reiterates the firm commitment of the Security Council to the fight against international terrorism — I would note the revitalized energy shown by previous speakers.

CTC and CTED continue to play a crucial role in the fight against international terrorism and in assisting Member States with the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). For many States, the task of concretely implementing resolution 1373 (2001) is still daunting. The donor community and recipient States need to cooperate actively if we are to have an efficient system for preventing terrorists from moving freely across international borders and for blocking their access to financial and economic resources, as well as weapons. In this area, CTED is in the best position to match the needs of many States with offers of assistance from other States and organizations. We must be frank; CTED has limited resources and does not have a magic hand to allow States to implement resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) immediately, comprehensively and effectively. What it can do is to continue monitoring implementation of the resolution and enhance — and this is the point — its role in facilitating and encouraging technical assistance through an improved mechanism.

The new Executive Director, Mr. Smith, has already undertaken very important action to fix the international problems within CTED. I will not repeat what colleagues have already said. The aim is to strengthen its ability to perform its multifaceted tasks, to communicate its activities more effectively to Member States and to integrate its action with all relevant actors within the framework of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. We wish to encourage him again to stay on his path. We confirm our solid support, as have all previous speakers, for the revised organizational plan that the CTC has recently endorsed.

In view of the new resolution on CTED's mandate, which Italy is willing and ready to co-sponsor, let me highlight three points.

First, we need to instil, in every possible manner, a truly cooperative spirit in the relationship between the CTC and CTED and the wider membership. We encourage the CTC to act on this message, also by revising its methods of work and its style of interaction with Member States and with the main international stakeholders in counter-terrorism. To that end, we would envisage having thematic discussions more frequently and in open formats. What Mr. Smith has said about the two smaller units — one on communications and outreach — is really what is needed. I will not repeat what Ambassador Kafando, Ambassador Ripert and Ambassador Verbeke have said about the importance of communications and outreach to the membership.

The second point, concerning the need for the Council's three counter-terrorism committees to cooperate with each other, has been stated repeatedly over many years, but evidently those committees still have to make progress in this area. We look forward to the Council's guidance in this matter. Too often old practices and procedures seem to count more that the objectives we want to achieve in this field. Italy would like that attitude to change. In future, the Council should also consider whether the time has come to create a unique support structure to replace the three groups of experts. That, under the Council's strategic direction, could help the actions of these committees. Such a move would enable a truly comprehensive approach, particularly to the dialogue with Member States not on the Council. It would also lend strength to the call for the whole system to take the coherent approach that is at the foundation of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

Third, the Global Strategy encompasses a more extensive set of actions to counter terrorism than those included in resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) and calls for all Member States, United Nations entities and other international organizations to act coherently. CTED has to respect the limits of its mandate as set by Security Council resolutions. However, within that mandate, we feel that CTED — and I repeat this — is in the best position to grasp all opportunities that the Strategy may create to counter terrorism in an effective and sustainable way.

Finally, Italy reaffirms its conviction that international terrorism can be fought more adequately through effective cooperation by the international community, as foreseen and repeated and enhanced in the organizational plan for CTED, in paragraph 2 (c) (S/2008/80, enclosure), and as so clearly delivered in all the statements by Mr. Smith. In this spirit Italy has sought to strengthen its collaboration with various countries and regional stakeholders by providing counter-terrorism technical assistance, in cooperation

with partners such as the African Centre for Study and Research on Terrorism, in the IGAD Capacity-building Programme against Terrorism in Africa and, in Asia, the Southeast Asia Regional Centre for Counter-Terrorism and the Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation.

With the Council's renewal of the CTED mandate, Italy will continue to assure its concrete support to all its efforts, while not neglecting the wider counter-terrorism efforts that take place in the context of the Global Strategy, to ensure overall concrete results, to save lives, and to support the victims of terrorism.

Mr. Liu Zhenmin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to congratulate Mr. Smith on his assumption of the post of Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED). We wish to thank him for his briefing to the Security Council.

We welcome constructive ideas proposed by the representatives at today's meeting regarding the future work of the Executive Directorate. We believe that the discussion today will help the Council, CTED and the Counter-terrorism Committee (CTC) carry out their work more effectively.

The fight against terrorism is a major common concern to mankind in today's world. Under the aegis of the United Nations and other international agencies, an international legal framework for the fight against it has been established, which provides the legal foundation for the efforts of various Governments and the United Nations against terrorism. The Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy was adopted by the General Assembly at its sixtieth session, in 2006 (General Assembly resolution 60/288). It reflects the common concern of countries about the question of terrorism.

It is the view of China that the United Nations plays an irreplaceable, central role in international cooperation against terrorism. We hope agencies within the United Nations system that are active in the area of counter-terrorism will implement the four pillars of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in a balanced manner and will reflect the concerns of various countries about terrorism in a fair and reasonable manner.

It is the consistent view of China that comprehensive measures against terrorism should pay attention to the various manifestations of terrorism and to its underlying causes so that both the manifestations and the root causes can be tackled. China is against any attempt to link terrorism to any specific religion or ethnic minority groups. China is also against the adoption of double standards in the fight against terrorism.

At present, acts of terrorism break out frequently around the world, which is ample proof that it poses a serious threat to international peace and security. It also highlights a need for the United Nations and the Security Council to continue to strengthen its fight against terrorism.

It is China's view that the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) constitutes an important part of the Security Council's efforts against terrorism, while CTED and its expert groups should continue their supporting role in the implementation of that resolution. China welcomes CTED's recently adopted reorganization plan. China appreciates CTED's measures to improve its consistency. We believe that the reorganization plan and the working recommendations will help increase the efficiency of CTED.

We hope that CTED will strengthen its communication with Member States so that the transparency of its work can be increased. China has noted that CTED is in the process of revising the global survey of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and will continue its dialogue with Member States by way of the preliminary implementation assessments. It is China's hope that in implementing those two important tasks, CTED will give full expression to the principle of consistency and to transparency so that its overall performance can be raised to a higher level.

It is the view of China that, although the Counter-Terrorism Committee and CTED are mandated to monitor and assist Member States in implementing resolution 1373 (2001), it is the Member States themselves that are to implement that resolution. Therefore, in future, both the Counter-Terrorism Committee and CTED should give more consideration to the choices of Member States in identifying their domestic and counter-terrorism strategy and their methods of implementation; should give full

consideration to the specific conditions of each country and the practical difficulties in assessing implementation; and should try to be fair and reasonable. When offering technical assistance, efforts should be made to meet the needs and desires of the Member States.

The Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy is the embodiment of the common understanding among countries against terrorism. It covers various aspects of the United Nations efforts against terrorism. It also provides a framework for effective cooperation between the United Nations and the international community in the fight against terrorism. China supports the active engagement of CTED within its terms of reference in the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and calls on it to increase its cooperation with the vast majority of Member States so that the United Nations and the Security Council can play an even greater leading role in the international fight against terrorism.

Over the past few years, under the policy guidance of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, CTED has done a tremendous amount of effective work in the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and has thus become an important and integral part of the Security Council counter-terrorism mechanism machinery. China supports the extension of the mandate of CTED by the Security Council. We hope that CTED will continue to adhere to the principles of cooperation, transparency and even-handedness, in a continuous effort to improve its working methods so that it can make greater contributions to the implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) and the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy.

Mr. Natalegawa (Indonesia): I should like to begin by once again, and formally, congratulating Mr. Mike Smith on assuming the responsibilities of Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED). We thank him very much for submitting the revised organizational plan for CTED, as required by resolution 1787 (2007). The revised organizational plan offers the potential to strengthen the role of CTED in monitoring the implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001).

My delegation specifically notes with appreciation the emphasis of CTED on the guiding principles of cooperation, transparency and even-handedness. Those guiding principles are essential, not only to uphold the credibility of the work of CTED, but also to ensure that its work will be guided by a clearer platform in achieving concrete, practical and measurable results within its mandate. In addition to the current key activities, Indonesia welcomes the recommendation that the CTED give greater priority to three additional activities.

With regard to its comprehensive strategy with donors, CTED should ensure that technical assistance aimed at increasing the national capabilities of Member States in the fight against terrorism be guided by their specific needs.

As for its communication strategy, my delegation hopes that it will serve as primary framework for CTED in conducting a tailored dialogue among CTED, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and Member States.

On the cooperation between the Counter-Terrorism Committee and other counter-terrorism related subsidiary bodies, it is our view that CTED should develop new mechanisms and practices with a view to strengthening such cooperation.

As far as CTED visits are concerned, Indonesia supports the idea of developing a more flexible system in order to allow for tailored and focused visits to countries in all regions. In that regard, my delegation would also like to reiterate the need for CTED to employ a more balanced geographical approach in proposing States to be visited to the Counter-Terrorism Committee.

My delegation underscores the need for CTED, in undertaking its activities, to continue to respect international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law. We deem that it is important for CTED to continue to advise the Counter-Terrorism Committee on issues relating to laws in relation with the identification and implementation of effective measures to implement resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005).

Indonesia also wishes to stress the need for CTED to present an accurate picture in finalizing the global survey of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). My delegation reiterates its view that CTED should ensure a consistent method of work and a balanced approach in preparing the global survey.

With regard to the implementation of resolution 1624 (2005), Indonesia encourages CTED to continue to provide necessary support for the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee in developing a more

effective strategy to promote its dialogue with Member States and to assist their capacity-building to implement resolution 1624 (2005). In implementing the resolution, Indonesia continues its efforts to promote dialogue, tolerance and mutual understanding between faiths and civilizations. Indonesia is quite willing to share its experience in sponsoring a number of interfaith dialogues aimed at enhancing dialogue and broadening understanding among civilizations. .

Indonesia maintains that the full implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) constitutes only part of the comprehensive efforts at combating the threat of terror. Indonesia attaches great importance to the effective implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy as an integrated approach in addressing terrorism. Therefore, the active participation of CTED and support of all relevant activities under the Strategy is important. It is also important that CTED play a more active role in promoting regional cooperation on counter-terrorism.

Not least, the implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) should complement regional and national efforts on counter-terrorism. Such national and regional efforts have yielded concrete results. Indonesia has spearheaded cooperation in law enforcement, border control and the enactment of legislative frameworks for counter-terrorism. The Bali counter-terrorism process, for instance, has established strong bonds of collaboration among legal and law enforcement practitioners in the region. We have developed practical solutions to some of the challenges facing effective national and regional counter-terrorism efforts. The Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation, which was referred to by Mr. Spatafora just now, has, for several years now, provided structured training for law enforcement officers of the region. It has also served as a venue for various specialized regional workshops, with an intensive focus on counter-terrorism. The contribution of Indonesia was also evident in the regional effort to bring about the conclusion of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Convention on Counter-Terrorism.

Finally, recognizing the work of the CTED, Indonesia supports the renewal of the mandate of CTED and the implementation of the recommendations contained in its revised organizational plan. We believe that it will enable CTED to promote global collective action, intensify regional efforts and strengthen national endeavours in countering terrorism.

Mr. Kumalo (South Africa): We, too, wish to thank Mr. Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), for his informative briefing on his organizational plan. It is absolutely crucial that CTED assess the manner in which it has been executing its mandate and address problem areas. We note that CTED's organizational plan is ambitious in its objectives, and rightly so.

But, before I comment on the CTED plan, I wish to say that it is indeed noteworthy that the Security Council is conducting an open debate on counter-terrorism. That approach should be welcomed. Counter-terrorism is not the sole preserve of the Council. In fact, it is the belief of my delegation that the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy will be even more strengthened if it can also benefit from the activities of CTED. Counter-terrorism is a collective effort that should be supported through CTED in order to put an end to terrorism. Consequently, it is gratifying that all Member States are being consulted when deciding on mandates such as that of CTED.

CTED has to adopt a more tailored approach in its assessment of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). It should be an approach that is aligned with the unique situations and capacities of Member States. That is a prominent feature of Mr. Smith's organizational plan, and it should be supported, as it is a departure from the one-size-fits-all approach that has characterized the work of CTED in the past. Interaction with Member States through less-formal visits will be less of a drain on CTED's resources and will also benefit CTED as a whole. However, we are still concerned that there is an overemphasis on visits to developing countries. That overemphasis reinforces the perception that shortcomings in the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) are prevalent only in certain countries, which is not true. This has to be corrected, and CTED's activities, including its travel plan, should reflect its guiding principles of cooperation, transparency and even-handedness.

Mr. Smith stated in his briefing that he has identified consistency, technical assistance and communication as three specific priorities. These relate directly to the credibility of CTED. If the Directorate

fails — or is perceived to be failing — in one of those areas, that will have a negative impact on its credibility. We note that Mr. Smith has established a quality control unit and cross-cutting functional groups. We want to express our support, and we call on Mr. Smith to keep the Counter-Terrorism Committee up to date regarding the effectiveness of reorganization and whether it is delivering on the projected milestones.

The facilitation of technical assistance will continue to be a key component of the CTED mandate. We support the intention of the Executive Director to closely match the needs of Member States with what can be offered by donors. We would, however, caution CTED not to fall into the trap of perpetuating a practice whereby donors continue to dictate and intended recipient Member States are passive participants in identifying their own needs, including the implementation of technical assistance. We support CTED in its intention to strengthen its relations with regional organizations, as that is an absolute necessity.

My delegation supports the fact that CTED will be participating actively in the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, as the Strategy represents the collective effort of the United Nations to address terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, as well as the conditions conducive to its spread. It would benefit both CTED and the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force if they embarked on coordinated actions.

There is still no effective coordination among the expert bodies of the Council's counter-terrorism subsidiary bodies, despite many calls for such coordination. There have been attempts at joint visits and information exchange, but they have not produced the desired results. My delegation therefore calls on the Executive Director to make this a priority by ensuring that there is better coordination and that commonalities are emphasized, as opposed to accentuating differences of mandate. We have to rationalize resources and prevent duplication. It is also opportune for the Council to consider consolidating the mandates of its counter-terrorism subsidiary bodies. Continuing with separate mandates will only perpetuate duplication, waste resources and result in confusion on the part of Member States.

It is important that the Council continue to provide direction regarding the activities of CTED, and the comprehensive reviews are a crucial part of that. My delegation therefore urges that future comprehensive reviews be used to consult with the wider United Nations membership. That would truly demonstrate the global nature of the counter-terrorism efforts of the United Nations and the fact that Member States are united.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes Mr. Smith well, and we pledge our continued cooperation and support to him in the pursuit of his mandate.

Mr. Le Luong Minh (Viet Nam): Terrorism is a concern shared by the entire membership of the United Nations and the international community at large. My delegation supported your decision, Mr. President, to organize this open debate, as a result of our understanding that broad participation by United Nations Member States in this debate would contribute not only to the promotion of our common efforts in the fight against terrorism, but also to the effectiveness of those efforts. I thank Mr. Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), for his briefing. We appreciate his efforts to improve the organization and the working methods of CTED, as reflected in the proposed changes set out in the organizational plan presented to the Council in document S/2008/80.

International terrorism continues to be one of the most serious threats to international peace and security. It constitutes a flagrant violation of international law, endangers the territorial integrity and stability of States and causes severe damage to the infrastructure of many countries and horrifying losses and injuries to innocent people. Viet Nam has been consistent in its condemnation of terrorist attacks in whatever form, for whatever motive and by whomsoever committed, including those committed under the pretext of defending democracy and human rights. At the same time, we are against linking terrorism to any religion.

We support the view that the international fight against terrorism must be strengthened in a comprehensive and balanced manner in compliance with international law, particularly the principles of respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Phenomena such as political, economic and social inequalities, double standards and selectivity, as well as the use of force in international relations — all of which create conditions conducive to the spread of

terrorism — need to be addressed, together with the root causes of international terrorism, such as absolute poverty and political and social injustices. In the fight against international terrorism, the United Nations must continue to play a leading role, especially in promoting international cooperation and complementing the efforts of Member States.

Acting under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter, the Security Council adopted resolution 1373 (2001), stipulating as concrete obligations that Member States shall undertake to prevent and suppress terrorist attacks. By the same resolution, the Council decided to establish the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) to monitor the implementation of those obligations.

The CTED, established by the Council in March 2004 and tasked to support CTC in performing its mandate of monitoring the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and continuing the capacity-building work that CTC had undertaken, has completed in its first three-year mandate.

My delegation aligns itself with the conclusions by the Council as reflected in the statements by the President of the Council contained in documents S/PRST/2005/64 of 21 December 2005 and S/PRST/2006/56 of 20 December 2006. Viet Nam has been supportive of CTED in its dialogues with Member States to identify ways of improving their counterterrorism capacity as well as its efforts to provide them with technical assistance.

In August last year, CTED undertook a visit to Viet Nam where it had fruitful discussions with Vietnamese counter-terrorism agencies. We are committed to continued cooperation with CTED, especially in the follow-up to the visits and in contributing to the work of CTC. We concur with the CTED assessment that there have been further developments in both the threat that terrorism poses to us and how we face these challenges.

Much progress has been made in raising the awareness of Member States of their obligations under Security Council resolutions on counter-terrorism, as well as of the need to promote international cooperation in this connection. Member States now look to the United Nations agencies for assistance to strengthen their capacity and expertise for effective implementation of their counter-terrorism obligations.

Acknowledging the crucial role of CTED in supporting CTC in its efforts to fulfil its overarching goal of ensuring the full implementation of Security Council resolution 1373 (2001), Viet Nam will support the renewal of the mandate of CTED for three years, as specified in paragraph 2 of resolution 1535 (2004). We call for further emphasis by CTED on the guiding principles of cooperation, transparency and even-handedness.

We welcome the decision of CTC to direct CTED in developing a more flexible approach to visits to countries, which would allow more focused visits, tailored to the needs and situation of the country concerned. We encourage CTED to work out a more comprehensive strategy for engagement with donors to match their capabilities and programs with the capacity-building requirements of Member States.

We welcome the readiness of CTED to participate in and support all relevant activities under the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, including its more active involvement in the work of the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force.

Mr. Arias (Panama) (*spoke in Spanish*): First and foremost, Mr. President, allow me to thank you, personally, and the delegation of the Russian Federation for convening this important open debate on the renewal and updating of the mandate of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED).

In turn, I would like to thank Ambassador Mike Smith for his detailed briefing on the review and suggestions regarding the organizational plan and working methods of the Executive Directorate.

I would like to start by indicating that, in the opinion of my delegation, the success of the efforts of the United Nations in the fight against terrorism will largely depend on the acceptance of these efforts by the Member States and their cooperation in them.

Therefore, Panama welcomes the process launched by Mr. Smith, who, through a broad-ranging process of consultations with the membership of the Organization, has recommended a number of modifications to the organizational plan and to the working methods of the Executive Directorate. It is important for the Executive Directorate to maintain this approach of organizing consultations with the membership whenever it takes action.

Among the proposed changes, we would like to single out the following: the format of visits, the intention of the Executive Directorate to participate more actively in the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force and the internal reorganization of the Directorate.

With regard to the visits of the Executive Directorate, it is worth recalling, during the year when we chaired the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), visits to specific countries were the subject of lengthy discussions. At that time, the Committee and its Executive Directorate lacked the necessary procedures to set clear objectives for these visits. This, combined with the fact that only developing countries were visited, could be perceived as a selective decision.

The new proposal, which will allow for greater flexibility in the nature and aims of the visits, will both have positive results and establish criteria for deciding which countries are to be visited. In particular, we welcome the planned visits to developed countries in order to monitor their compliance with resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) and in order to draw on their experience in providing technical assistance to countries which need it and have sought it.

With regard to the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, as adopted by the General Assembly, we wish to emphasize that its comprehensive nature gives scope for addressing issues, such as the root causes of terrorism, which, given their nature, are not, strictly speaking, within the mandate of CTC.

In this regard, we welcome the decision of the Executive Directorate to step up its involvement in the Task Force, and we recommend that it make contributions alongside this Task Force, in accordance with its mandate. This would avoid duplication of effort and enhance the coordination of the entire United Nations system in combating this scourge.

We also support greater interaction between the CTC and CTED on the one hand and the Human Rights Council and the Office of the High Commissioner on the other.

With regard to internal reorganization, we take note, with interest, of the establishment of thematic groups, as well as the two new entities, one, dealing with the quality control of documents, the other dealing with communication and outreach.

We take note of the relevance of these new innovations in order to achieve greater accuracy and a closer and enhanced style of the work in question between the Executive Directorate and the Member States. This would thus contribute to the effective implementation of its mandate.

Finally, we agree with Mr. Smith regarding the importance of ensuring consistency in the work of the Executive Directorate. This is a technical Secretariat, composed of various experts with a specific mandate. All documents and evaluations submitted by the Executive Directorate should be based on technical criteria, avoiding any form of political consideration.

It is only thus that the Executive Directorate will be able to fulfil the mission entrusted to it. Taking into account the information submitted to us by Mr. Smith, Panama supports the renewal of the mandate of the Executive Directorate and wishes it every success in carrying out its functions.

Mr. Urbina (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to begin by thanking you, Mr. President, for convening this open debate on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. I would also like to acknowledge your willingness to organize numerous public meetings of the Security Council that are open to all Member States without sacrificing the effectiveness of the Council. I should also like to congratulate Ambassador Smith on being named Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED), as well as to thank him very much for his briefing today. That briefing shows a clear awareness of the need to help States to equip themselves with the skills and knowledge required to implement the necessary measures in the fight against terrorism. We fully support the changes he has made with regard to CTED's working methods and the Assessment and Technical Assistance Office.

My delegation associates itself with the statement to be made later by the Ambassador of Mexico on behalf of the Rio Group.

The United Nations initiated a coherent response as soon as the international community realized the grave threat to international peace and security posed by international terrorism. The adoption of resolution 1267 (1999), in October 1999, launched the development of a robust institutional mechanism to respond to this new threat. Subsequently, given the

international emergency resulting from the terrorist acts committed at the beginning of the century, the Organization increased the number of committees, commissions, offices and programmes to combat terrorism and prevent the threat that it poses to the peace and security of all.

Two important processes were thereby launched. First, a normative process was begun under a body that was essentially executive in nature. We should devote time in the future to evaluating that process. The second process, which is the subject of our discussion today, was the development of a very ambitious institutional mechanism — one that requires greater coordination. That may perhaps be due to a sense of urgency as well as the Council's own limitations as an intergovernmental political body of a basically executive nature. Those circumstances gradually led to an institutional model that would be able to tackle the most urgent tasks, but one that we believe lacked the necessary coherence. The passage of time since our first response has allowed us to identify and overcome some of those limitations. We now have a better understanding of the scope of the challenges that we previously could only guess at.

We have also discovered strengths there were not previously apparent. In that regard, the adoption of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy was a milestone. In 2006, we decided by consensus to make an effort to promote a response to terrorism that would be system-wide, coherent and effective. The challenge we now face is how to translate our previous agreements into specific actions, in particular as regards the speedy institutionalization and launching of the task force to implement the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism. Costa Rica believes that it is of fundamental importance that we strengthen communication and coordination between the main committees, departments, commissions and programmes active in this area. We also believe that, under the guidance of the General Assembly, it would be desirable to strengthen the efforts and initiatives recently being developed by various entities of the United Nations system.

Costa Rica, of course, supports renewing the mandate of the Executive Directorate. However, we are certain that the coming two years and a few months should allow us all to expedite the intensification of the efforts to which I have referred.

The United Nations must, once and for all, be able to have at its disposal an executive body that comprises the mandates, resources and technical capacities necessary to combat terrorism.

Mr. Ettalhi (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate on an issue of great importance. I should also like to join others in thanking Mr. Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), for his valuable briefing to the Security Council. We have every confidence in his competence and shall continue to support his efforts. We also appreciate the efforts of Ambassador Jurica of Croatia, Chairman of the CTC.

We welcome the CTC's adoption of the revised organizational plan for CTED, which was submitted in accordance with resolution 1787 (2007), including the proposals and amendments it suggests. The new priorities contained in the organizational plan are not just intended to support CTED's role as a diplomatic mission of the CTC. They also serve to enhance the fight against terrorism through all the organs and agencies of the United Nations. Given that they are intended to bolster national capacities in the area of counter-terrorism and help to implement the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy — adopted through General Assembly resolution 60/288 — and also taking into account the obligations established by international law in all its branches, it is our hope that all those steps will pave the way towards eradicating the root causes of terrorism and punishing its perpetrators.

The rationale for developing a counter-terrorism mechanism that includes the entire United Nations system, since the time of the adoption of the original organizational plan for CTED, has evolved into a new reality that the CTC and CTED cannot ignore. The work of the General Assembly to develop the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, the efforts to put in place a comprehensive convention on terrorism, and the calls for establishing a clear definition of terrorism should all lead to an internationally agreed transparent and balanced definition of terrorism that ensures the success of counter-terrorism efforts at all levels.

The international community's efforts to combat terrorism — which constitutes the worst and most

flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations as well as of the principal tenets, beliefs and moral values of the world's main religions — would be more effective if they were more comprehensive and transparent. We cannot reach this objective through selective measures and procedures. If it is not possible to justify terrorism in any way then we should not confuse its justifications and its causes. Our consensus in excluding justifications should not lead us to ignore the causes of terrorism or adjust them to agree with the pretexts of self-defence according to some, or with terrorism according to others.

The diagnosis or objective treatment of the causes of terrorism is at the core of any serious efforts to deal with this disease or scourge. The fact that there is no balanced and transparent diagnosis and treatment of the causes of this disease, makes our meetings and documents no more than mere condemnations and briefings about such repeated human tragedies.

Occupation and its injustices and terrorist aspects; disregard for human rights and the rights of peoples; accusations against cultures and civilizations; ignoring the legitimate objectives of resistance against occupation; and double standards in international legitimacy do not simply represent hatred in a moral sense, but rather contravene all heavenly religions and beliefs. These are all symptoms of frustration, hatred and despair that manifest themselves in many parts of the world in violent acts.

My country, Libya, which has been the victim of terrorist activities in different manifestations and acts, has adopted, within the framework of the United Nations and the geographic groups, various regional and international conventions, agreements and protocols. It condemns all forms of terrorism, including direct and indirect State terrorism. We continue to support international activities that aim at ending this scourge and eliminating its symptoms and causes. Within that context, my delegation supports the extension of the mandate of CTED and would like to express its appreciation of the continuation of its efforts and others' efforts to bring about the objectives of the international community, namely, to eliminate terrorism. All societies, without exception, suffer from that scourge, and we support any efforts to achieve a world in which security and peace prevail.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Russian Federation.

In my capacity as representative of the Russian Federation, I would like to associate myself with all of the previous speakers' words of gratitude addressed to the Executive Director of Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), Mr. Smith, for today's comprehensive briefing and all of his very substantial work.

Today's meeting, attended by many United Nations Member States' delegations, is, in our view, yet another confirmation of the fact that the Security Council continues to play a very important role in efforts aimed at countering international terrorism. It also confirms that the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and its Executive Directorate are both repositories for our hopes for stepped-up cooperation and a strengthening of States' security in this field.

Since the adoption of resolution 1373 (2001) in September 2001, CTED has achieved substantial progress in working with States on implementing its key provisions, whether it be creating the necessary legislative basis or strengthening regional cooperation mechanisms. However, it is, of course, still premature to speak of full implementation of the resolution or to set out rigid timeframes for this process. Thus far, the level of results achieved in individual areas of counter-terrorism activities is quite varied. This is also true of the state of the implementation of the resolution from one region to another and from one country to the next.

The creation of a genuinely reliable system to counter-terrorism requires additional efforts — mainly the development of continuous and close dialogue between CTED and Member States. The main task today is not merely to monitor the implementation by States of resolution 1373 (2001), but it is also to precisely assess the capacities of States and the readiness of CTED to mobilize the necessary resources to provide technical assistance.

The Russian Federation welcomes CTED's new organizational plan, which incorporates these very principles as its foundation. I again wish to underscore the fact that its final objective is to strengthen CTED's functions as a coordinator for technical assistance, forming a link in the chain between donors and interested States. We expect that, as a result of the aforementioned organizational reforms, CTED will be

in a position to more effectively focus on the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and thus organically involve itself in the important process of implementing the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Strategy, and to contribute to the work carried out under the aegis of the corresponding Secretariat task force.

We are convinced that the organizational plan will form a sound basis for strengthening CTED's capacity. Here, we especially note such important elements as the transition to closer dialogue with potential donors, the development of cooperation with international and regional organizations and improving the practice of CTED's country visits: tailoring them to the specific cooperation needs of individual States.

We note with satisfaction the readiness of CTED to continue dialogue with States on implementing resolution 1624 (2005), which remains an important element of CTC's mandate.

I would like to highlight one other issue and to underscore the special importance, which we attach to the conclusion of CTED's preparation of the draft global assessment of the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), agreed with the CTC. In our view, the earlier the Security Council receives such a consolidated analysis, the more rapidly we will be in a position to identify concrete achievements and shortcomings in our endeavour to resolve this task of overriding importance and measures, which CTED could implement under the aegis of the CTC.

I now resume my function as President of the Security Council.

I now give the floor to the representative of Japan.

Mr. Kodera (Japan) (*spoke in Russian*): At the outset, I would like to convey my gratitude to you, Mr. President, for organizing this open debate.

(*spoke in English*)

I would like first to express Japan's appreciation for the efforts that have been made to reform the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) since the inauguration of the new Executive Director, Mr. Michael Smith. I would also like to welcome the organizational plan, which has just been adopted.

We support the extension of CTED's mandate through the end of 2010. We do so because we believe a medium- to long-term point of view is essential to the success of the coordination of technical assistance. At the same time, it is important that we give ourselves sufficient opportunity to conduct reviews, through which we can monitor the activities of CTED in order to determine whether they are producing satisfactory results, in addition to discussing the need for any improvements in the working methods of the Directorate.

The review of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which was adopted by consensus in September 2006, is scheduled to take place in September this year. The work of the CTED is central to the implementation of the Strategy. In this context, we welcome the active participation of CTED in the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force and its working groups.

As chair of the G-8 this year, the Government of Japan intends to see that, as one of its highest priorities, the G-8 and its Counterterrorism Action Group (CTAG) grapple with the question of how to enhance cooperation with CTED. For instance, we would like to promote substantive discussions at CTAG meetings by strengthening information-sharing through New York and other channels and to pave the way to providing concrete capacity-building assistance in the area of counter-terrorism. Also, we would like to promote further utilization of CTAG in following up CTED visits to Member States.

CTED has been engaged in visits to States and in drafting the preliminary implementation assessment. Securing sufficient assistance to meet the needs identified through that process will contribute considerably to the implementation of the Strategy by Member States. I would also note that establishing a record of such achievements will increase the appreciation Member States feel to CTED for the work it is doing.

The reform efforts launched by new Executive Director are taking CTED in the right direction, but it is essential that they produce tangible results. We therefore hope that under Mr. Smith CTED will continue the efforts, bearing in mind the urgency of the task.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I give the floor next to the representative of Turkey.

Mr. İlkin (Turkey): Turkey aligns itself with the statement that will be made on behalf of the European Union. Given the importance we attach to this agenda item, I wish to make a few remarks from the national point of view.

Turkey, as a country that has suffered from terrorism for more than 20 years, has been at the forefront of efforts to eradicate this scourge. However, terrorism is not a phenomenon peculiar to a certain country or a certain region. Tragic events around the globe have proven that no country or region can consider itself immune from terrorism. Hence, the fight against terrorism should be a priority for all. Likewise, one of the most important prerequisites of the success in this fight is international cooperation.

At this point, I would like to refer to Security Council resolution 1373 (2001), which calls upon Member States to work together to suppress and prevent terrorist acts through increased cooperation. I do not want to go into the details of that landmark resolution, but allow me to underline some its provisions that deserve particular attention as to the need for international cooperation.

First, denial of safe haven to terrorists is one of the fundamental obligations set out in that resolution, and it certainly requires a more advanced level of cooperation among the interested countries.

Secondly, the responsibility to end impunity for terrorists is also an essential element of the resolution. That can be achieved only by ensuring that terrorists are brought to justice, that punishment envisaged in domestic laws duly reflects the seriousness of terrorist acts and that refugee status is not abused by terrorists.

The resolution indeed highlights the necessity for increased international cooperation. We strongly believe that resolution 1373 (2001) provides a firm basis for a coordinated and united response to terrorism. However, the resolution can yield the desired results only if it is implemented by all Member States to the fullest extent. In this regard, we hope that the recently introduced preliminary implementation assessment mechanism, which is expected to identify the areas where countries need to take additional measures, will improve the implementation of that important resolution.

On the other hand, intensified dialogue between the Member States and the United Nations could also help detect some of the shortfalls in the fight against terrorism. It is with this understanding we accepted the offer by the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED) to visit Turkey last year. We hope and expect that CTED will be able to visit other countries that have become targets or safe havens for terrorists.

Finally, mutual legal assistance and full respect for the obligation to extradite or prosecute set the framework of international cooperation in the fight against terrorism. In this regard, we welcome the creation of technical groups, as indicated in the revised organizational plan for CTED, which will be dealing, inter alia, with general legal issues such as extradition and mutual legal assistance.

Living in a peaceful and secure world is a goal shared by all Member States of the United Nations, and this goal can only be achieved through determined international cooperation to eradicate the scourge of terrorism.

Before concluding my remarks, I also wish to extend our congratulations to the new Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, His Excellency Mr. Neven Jurica, and to the new Executive Director of CTED, Mr. Mike Smith, and reiterate that we will lend them all the support that is needed.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now call on the representative of India.

Mr. Sen (India): At the outset I thank you, Mr. President, for scheduling this open debate on an issue that has, unfortunately, become a defining element of our world. Terrorism grew steadily through the twentieth century to become one of the leading strategic, political and developmental challenges of the twenty-first century.

India's advocacy of international cooperation in order to fight the threat of terrorism predates most measures taken by the Security Council or the General Assembly; indeed, it predates serious consideration of the issue of terrorism within the United Nations. That is because India has been, and unfortunately remains, a victim of international terrorism. In less than 25 years, over 60,000 have been killed in various parts of India as a direct result of terrorism, quite apart from the concomitant impact upon our economy.

India therefore has an overriding interest in greater and more meaningful international cooperation

to counter terrorism. That also underscores the rationale behind our conviction that no political cause, no argument, no belief can or should be used to justify acts of terrorism. That Mahatma Gandhi preferred to call off his mass movement and postpone the independence of India rather than compromise with violence at Chauri Chaura gives us the right to say this.

We continue to call upon the world to act as one in denying terrorists, their ideologues and financiers access to arms, funds and means of transportation of their deadly goods, as well as safe havens.

However, as an unfortunate but inevitable result of our tragic history of dealing with terrorism, India has accumulated the expertise and experience for doing so. Our own efforts utilize all available tools within the arsenal of a democratic nation governed by the rule of law. They run the gamut of efforts from surveillance methods governed by law, monitoring financial flows and effective legislation regarding dual-use items to old-fashioned police investigation work. Yet we recognize that no matter how comprehensive the effort, there is always the chance of one catastrophic failure. It is in recognition of this that we seek a comprehensive international effort to counter terrorism.

In that context, despite counter-terrorism being taken up more seriously by the United Nations in general and the Security Council in particular, there is limited evidence of a genuinely common effort to create a more unified international response to terrorism. We have argued for over a decade, and we continue to believe, that agreement on a comprehensive convention on international terrorism should have been a first step in any consolidated counter-terrorism efforts within the United Nations. Such a convention would provide the legal framework for an effective counter-terrorism strategy. We remain convinced that a comprehensive convention on international terrorism must be agreed upon if we are to have a strong interlocking network of Member States, international organizations and specialized agencies functioning together in unison to counter terrorism.

We do not need a philosophical definition of terrorism. Paragraph 1 of draft article 2 enunciates clearly the criminal law definition of terrorist acts. Current proposals address effectively the question of offences governed by international humanitarian law and those governed by the convention. What is now needed, therefore, is the political will to conclude the convention. The Security Council's efforts could be maintained on the basis of such a resolution passed by the General Assembly.

Over and above our commitment to the early conclusion of a comprehensive convention, which we initiated at the Assembly's fifty-first session, we see merit in a pragmatic approach to the various counter-terrorism mechanisms and elements that already exist. We have adopted such an approach in working with and supporting the efforts of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC), the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999) concerning Al-Qaida and the Taliban and associated individuals and entities and the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1540 (2004) — we articulated our views at that time on resolution 1540 (2004) — and their expert panels. Not the least of those measures was welcoming a joint visit of experts coordinated by the CTED, which included experts from the Monitoring Team of the 1267 Committee and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), to India in November 2006 and sharing our mutual experiences. Our approach is guided by the conviction that the sum of our collective efforts can indeed be greater than the total of each individual nation's part in the battle against terrorism.

Therefore, I should like to state for the record the following. India welcomes the revised organizational plan of the CTED, as contained in document S/2008/80. We hope that it will bring about greater flexibility of approach and effectiveness of operation.

We also look forward to greater efforts to bring together interrelated aspects of the operational mechanisms of the 1267 Committee, the 1540 Committee and the CTC, and dovetailing them with the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force. India hopes that all those efforts within the United Nations will be integrated more closely, with the core tasks being taken forward by specialized bodies such as UNODC, INTERPOL, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Maritime Organization.

Therefore, India strongly affirms the importance of a collective effort to focus on technical assistance in the larger struggle against terrorism, in helping States implement the mandate of the CTC and related instruments.

India is willing to provide all assistance in the larger effort to counter the threat of terrorism. Our commitment to do so is already on record, in India's fifth report submitted to the CTC in March 2007, and we are willing to share information with other relevant United Nations mechanisms that work in those fields. We are willing to render such assistance bilaterally or multilaterally, especially in the instance of countries that are themselves not directly threatened by terrorism but whose participation is vital to the success of the larger international effort.

We would, however, urge that there be greater efforts to follow up on information obtained from Member States as part of the effort against terrorism. Pooling our collective knowledge and expertise is desirable but can succeed only when there is adequate evidence that it is both welcome and necessary.

The political and socio-economic programme of fundamentalists is always deeply reactionary and exploitative. History teaches us that to prevent fundamentalist terrorist forces from occupying space for dissent, democratic and secular forces must be strengthened, not weakened. The larger effort to foster international cooperation requires greater cooperation between the members of the Security Council and the larger United Nations membership. We hope that today's exercise is the first of more efforts to build closer cooperation within the international system.

In conclusion, allow me to also congratulate the Chairman of the Counter-Terrorism Committee, Mr. Jurica, and thank Mr. Mike Smith, the Executive Director of CTED, both for his presentation today, on which I have been briefed by my colleague, and for the vigour and commitment he has brought to his post. We wish him every success in making CTED a responsive and flexible tool in the larger fight against terror.

(*spoke in Russian*)

Along with you, Mr. President, we know first-hand what terrorism is. The cooperation of the international community is an absolute necessity.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Malmierca Díaz (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Cuban delegation, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, and your team for the work carried out by the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. We would also like to express our gratitude for the information conveyed to us this morning by Mr. Mike Smith, Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED).

The fight against terrorism is an issue that reaches far beyond the context of the Security Council. This problem constitutes a priority for all peace-loving Member States of the United Nations, not simply for those who are permanent or temporary members of this organ.

For Cuba, the fight against terrorism in all its forms and manifestations is a priority. Our country has never allowed nor will it allow its territory to be used for terrorist actions against any State, without exception. We firmly uphold the view that only authentic and effective international cooperation that enables the prevention and combating of all acts of terrorism will provide an effective and sustainable response to the scourge of terrorism at the global level.

For years, our delegation has regularly submitted detailed information to the Security Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee on the terrorist actions of several individuals and organizations targeting Cuba and on the complicit protection and tolerance that the United States Government accords them. However, we do not know whether any action has been taken to even assess the information that has been submitted, or whether any investigation of the United States' failure to comply with the several resolutions adopted by this organ has been undertaken.

We have made statements in this Chamber on more than one occasion to warn of the release of the international terrorist Luis Posada Carriles. We have repeatedly requested that concrete steps be taken to prevent the commission of such a despicable act, which has now become a reality. The CTC has been informed of this in a timely and detailed manner.

Posada Carriles, who is rightly considered the most notorious terrorist of the Western Hemisphere, was released last year, in spite of the fact that there was enough evidence linking him to some of the most infamous crimes of the twentieth century, including the downing of flight 455 of Cubana de Aviación in 1976, the Iran Contra scandal and the bombings in Havana tourist centres in 1997.

Despite of recognizing Posada Carriles' notorious and reprehensible actions, the United States

Government only charged him with minor migration crimes. That would have been the right time to indict him for his lengthy record. There is plenty of evidence to prove it. Declassified documents of the Federal Bureau of Investigations and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and Posada Carriles' own confessions are enough evidence to indict him as a confessed terrorist. There is no doubt today that the true intention was to prevent the details of his mindlessly destructive actions under CIA orders from becoming public. The secrets Posada Carriles knows will come to light sooner or later. The truth will not be concealed forever.

A new smokescreen was raised on 6 November 2007 when the United States Government filed an appeal in a federal court to release Posada Carriles. That act is a further manoeuvre to cover up guilt of that confessed international terrorist. The appeal fails to mention his lengthy terrorist record. They insist on treating the case as a minor migration crime. They thus ensure the terrorist's definitive freedom and the withdrawal of all charges against him.

Cuba appears again before the Security Council to strongly denounce and condemn the complicity and absolute responsibility of the United States Government for this individual's release. Next October will mark 32 years since the atrocious terrorist act committed by Posada Carriles and his henchmen against the Cubana de Aviación airliner that claimed the lives of 73 innocent civilians.

We must recall that another individual responsible for the midair bombing of the jetliner, Orlando Bosch, also enjoys every freedom in Miami, while he makes public statements bragging about his numerous terrorist acts against the Cuban people. Meanwhile, terrorist organizations continue to operate openly in Miami and other cities of this country, carrying out recruitment, training and fund-raising activities, the purchase of arms and the planning and execution of terrorist acts against our country.

Another example of the United States authorities' complicity with terrorist actions against Cuba is that just a few days ago a group of Posada Carriles' collaborators, including the terrorists Santiago Álvarez and Osvaldo Mitat, were given laughable sentences for obstructing the course of justice in refusing to testify against Posada, when they should have been sentenced, according United States law itself, for terrorism.

Security Council resolution 1373 (2001) calls upon all States to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts in another State or acquiescing in organized activities within its territory directed towards the commission of such acts. It also calls upon all States to, inter alia, ensure that any person who participates in such acts is brought to justice. Does this not apply to the United States?

While unscrupulous confessed terrorists remain at large, the United States authorities continue to hold hostage in high-security prisons five Cuban anti-terrorist fighters who, with great altruism and courage, were only trying to obtain information about Miami-based terrorist groups in order to prevent them from committing violent acts and to save the lives of Cuban and United States citizens. Once again, Cuba demands the immediate release of Gerardo Hernández, Ramón Labañino, Fernando González, Antonio Guerrero and René González.

Cuba reiterates its request to the Security Council and its Counter-Terrorism Committee to promptly pay heed to the detailed information with which our country has provided them and to take all appropriate measures set out in the relevant resolutions. In accordance with those resolutions, this organ must demand that the Government of the United States immediately sentence Luis Posada Carriles for his terrorist acts or extradite him to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, whose justice system has been pursuing him for years.

The fight against terrorism must be carried out in full. Terrorism must be rejected under any circumstances. It will not be possible to eradicate terrorism if only some terrorist acts are condemned while others are ignored, tolerated or justified, or if the issue is simply manipulated to promote petty political interests. Double standards and impunity cannot prevail in addressing this sensitive issue. The Security Council cannot maintain its complicit silence in the face of this gross affront to the victims of terrorism throughout the world.

As it has done thus far, Cuba will continue to abide strictly by the provisions of the resolutions adopted by the Security Council, including those related to the issue of terrorism, and will maintain its cooperation with the subsidiary bodies created under those resolutions. At the same time, we hope that this organ will, without further delay, make effective use of

the copious and detailed information provided by Cuba.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now call on the representative of Slovenia.

Ms. Štiglic (Slovenia): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU). The candidate countries Turkey, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro and Serbia, and the European Free Trade Association countries Iceland and Norway, members of the European Economic Area, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union strongly supports the work of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and its Executive Directorate (CTED) in promoting and monitoring the implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005) and welcomes the recent progress in their work. We look forward to further close and active cooperation with CTED and its Executive Director, Ambassador Mike Smith, as well as with the new Chairman of the CTC, Ambassador Neven Jurica, Permanent Representative of Croatia.

Terrorism is a global threat that requires a global and comprehensive response. In that regard, the United Nations is the only truly global forum, and the Security Council has a pivotal role in international action against terrorism. The EU reiterates once again that terrorism constitutes one of the most serious threats to international peace and security and that any acts of terrorism are criminal and unjustifiable, regardless of their motivation, wherever, whenever and by whomsoever committed. The EU is convinced that any measure taken to fight this scourge must be in accordance with obligations under international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law.

The EU recalls the extension of CTED's mandate on 10 December 2007 by Security Council resolution 1787 (2007) and supports further extension of CTED's mandate. The EU is convinced that that is a wise decision that will contribute substantially to the effectiveness of the global fight against terrorism.

The EU supports the effective continuation of CTED's work of facilitating capacity-building and advising the CTC on issues of international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law, in order to enhance the CTC's ability to monitor the implementation of resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). We recognize the crucial role of CTED in supporting the CTC in the fulfilment of its mandate. CTED has developed a constant dialogue and cooperation with Member States by visiting selected States, facilitating technical assistance and work to identify and help ensure that the priority needs of Member States can be met, and developing and drafting the Preliminary Implementation Assessments.

The EU welcomes and fully supports the organizational plan for CTED, prepared by its Executive Director, Mike Smith, and approved by the CTC. The EU believes that the revised organizational plan provides an excellent basis for CTED's future work. Proposals regarding enhanced monitoring, cooperation and coordination, strengthened facilitation of technical assistance and the need to ensure the consistency of activities and the improved exchange of information are measures that will, without any doubt, contribute to the efficiency and transparency of CTED's work.

The EU therefore fully agrees that CTED should continue to advise the CTC and should, in accordance with its mandate, even strengthen its role in facilitating technical assistance for the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001) and in enhancing Member States' capacity to identify and implement effective measures to fulfil their obligations, facilitating the provision of assistance to develop their capacity to protect their critical infrastructure against terrorist attacks. The EU therefore considers it important to maintain a tailored dialogue among CTED, the CTC and Member States to allow for regular exchange of information among the relevant entities.

We have always supported increased coordination and cooperation among the three Security Council Committees and their experts. In that regard, we support the decision to improve engagement with donors, to enhance the understanding of the role of CTED and to strengthen cooperation between CTED and the experts of the Security Council Committees established pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1540 (2004) and other relevant institutions such as the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. The proposed modifications to CTED's working methods

and the revised operational structure will further enhance CTED's active role in combating terrorism.

The EU strongly supports United Nations counter-terrorism cooperation and technical assistance projects with regional organizations. Relevant United Nations bodies, including the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, and members of CTED are regularly invited to attend meetings of the EU Council Working Group on Counter-Terrorism.

The EU believes it is important that all the parts of the United Nations system play their full roles in a coordinated manner to tackle terrorism. In that regard, among the priorities set out in the revised organizational plan are active CTED participation in the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force and maintaining close, collaborative and cooperative relations with the other members of the Task Force. The EU considers that the expert bodies of the three Security Council Committees, including CTED, play an important role in the implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. Furthermore, the EU is convinced that CTED will continue to substantially build upon and complement other global counter-terrorism activities.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now call on the representative of Australia.

Ms. Lisson (Australia): Australia is a strong supporter of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and its Executive Directorate (CTED). The CTC and CTED are central to the international community's response to the threat of international terrorism and are key components of the United Nations architecture constructed to help Member States deal with that challenge.

We thank the Executive Director of CTED, Mr. Mike Smith, for his informative briefing this morning and for his efforts to date in reviewing the Directorate's organization and methods of work.

The revised organizational plan for CTED, which was endorsed by the CTC last month, will serve to strengthen CTED, improve its operations and place it at the centre of the United Nations counter-terrorism effort. Australia welcomes the CTC's recognition of the need for CTED to participate actively in the work of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force that has been established to assist Member States in their implementation of the Global Strategy.

The unanimous adoption by the General Assembly of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy is an important achievement for the international community. The challenge now lies in translating the Strategy's commitments into concrete action to prevent, prosecute and punish terrorist acts, wherever they may occur.

Through engagement with the Task Force, CTED should play a constructive role in coordinating the counterterrorism activities of various United Nations agencies. Australia looks forward to working with a more effective, dynamic and responsive CTED. Australia strongly welcomes CTED's focus on improving Member States' capacity to implement all United Nations counter-terrorism resolutions. Counter-terrorism legislation serves no purpose without the capacity to put it into practice.

Australia's counter-terrorism capacity-building assistance, in our own region, focuses on providing practical assistance to achieve counter-terrorism successes on the ground. CTED's commitment to pursuing practical measures aimed at increasing the capabilities of Member States in the fight against terrorism is highly welcome.

In this context, Australia also welcomes CTED's renewed focus on engaging with donors who are active in the counter-terrorism field and on matching donor capabilities with recipients' needs. Constructive relations with donor and recipient countries and a practical focus on capabilities and needs are critical to the success of the work of the CTC and CTED.

The nature of the terrorist threat varies from State to State and region to region, as do State counter-terrorism capabilities and needs. Regional and subregional bodies have an important role to play in providing the United Nations counter-terrorism actors, including the CTC and CTED, with a better understanding of the local conditions and challenges. Australia supports CTED in its efforts to strengthen its relations with regional and subregional organizations in this area, as recognized in its revised organizational plan.

Australia also welcomes CTED's focus on the human rights aspects of counter-terrorism. We cannot effectively counter the threat of terrorism by using the same methods as terrorists. Counter-terrorism measures must respect human rights and the rule of law and strike the right balance between the protection of the

public from the terrorist threat and protection of civil liberties. CTED has a vital role to play in advising the CTC and Member States on ways to counter terrorism consistent with their obligations under international law, in particular international human rights, refugee and humanitarian law.

Finally, Australia remains ready to work with the CTC and CTED to further their objectives and improve their engagement with the United Nations membership. Australia is confident that with its revised organizational plan in place, CTED will be in a position to contribute fully and centrally to global efforts to combat terrorism.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I give the floor to the representative of Spain.

Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for giving my delegation this opportunity to participate on this open debate on threats that terrorist acts pose to international peace and security.

We fully subscribe to the contents of the statement made by the representative of Slovenia speaking on behalf of the European Union.

First I would like to reiterate the firm commitment of Spain in the fight against all forms of terrorism, whatever may be the motivation, and our wish that this struggle be an ongoing priority on the agenda of the international community and thus of the United Nations.

Terrorism is a global problem that can be effectively addressed only if we act in a decisive and coordinated manner. To that end, my Government is convinced that multilateral action is an indispensable approach for dealing with terrorist barbarity and wishes to emphasize again the central role that the United Nations should play in order to ensure legitimacy for the common efforts undertaken by its Member States and by international organizations, always in strict compliance with their obligations under international law.

The work accomplished by the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and its Executive Directorate over the last few years has been particularly relevant in serving to promote and monitor compliance with Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2004). Four years have gone by since the establishment of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), and now it is time to assess the progress that has been made by the Executive Directorate in fulfilling its mandate. Spain does this with particular satisfaction, as it was one of the first driving forces in its development during its term on the Security Council in 2003 and 2004, and because it chaired the CTC. Also, the first Executive Director of CTED, Mr. Javier Rupérez, was a Spaniard.

Since then Spain has continued to actively support CTED and remains committed to the development of its objectives. That commitment is manifested in the technical assistance that we have provided to various regions of the world and in various areas of activities such as legislative development and the fight against terrorism and its sources of financing, and in areas such as border control or the work carried out by police and security forces. Moreover, Spain has cooperated in the financing of activities such as the CTC's fifth special meeting on the prevention of terrorist movements and effective border control, which was organized by CTED with various international, regional and subregional organizations in Nairobi in October 2007.

We appreciate the recommendations made earlier by the Executive Director of CTED, Mr. Smith, aimed at modifying the Directorate's organizational plan, which proposes to update the scope of its functions, improve its tools, reform its working methodology and adapt its operational structure to the new needs and challenges that it faces. The presentation of this new organizational plan is a step forward and deserves our acknowledgement.

Spain welcomes the adoption of the revised organizational plan by the CTC under the skilled chairmanship of Croatia. We also approve the extension of the mandate of CTED by the Security Council.

We consider it very important that CTED should be able to continue to develop its work of assisting the CTC in fulfilling its mandate and to continue its efforts to strengthen its role as a facilitator of technical assistance between donor and recipient countries, to promote dialogue with Member States, intensify cooperation with international organizations, improve information on its work and step up cooperation with other specialized committees of the Security Council as well as with other United Nations bodies.

In September 2006, the General Assembly adopted by consensus the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and its Plan of Action (General Assembly resolution 60/288). For the implementation of this Strategy and Plan, an implementation team was put into place to coordinate the 24 units involved in this task within the United Nations system and beyond. Among the new challenges that CTED identified was the need to ensure its active participation in the work of this implementation task force, thus contributing towards coordinated and cohesive action within the United Nations. A year and a half has gone by now since the adoption of the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and efforts should indeed be redoubled in order to ensure its effective implementation. In order to make effective progress towards that goal, it is crucial that we enhance and increase coordination and collaboration between the General Assembly and the Security Council in all areas pertaining to the fight against terrorism. This is the challenge that we all must face and where we must spare no efforts.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mr. Heller (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the member States of the Rio Group: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Mexico.

The Rio Group would like to thank you, Mr. President, for holding this open debate and for placing it on the Council's agenda in order to follow the Council's activities with regard to the agenda item "Threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts". This forum of open debates and the increased interplay between the Council and its subsidiary bodies with non-Council member States constitute significant efforts without a doubt to achieve the common goal of this Organization in the fight against terrorism.

The Rio Group has taken particular note of the report introduced by the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED), whom we wish to welcome, pursuant to Security Council resolution 1787 (2007) and concerning the modifications made to the revised organizational plan of CTED (S/2008/80).

The report shows that important steps have been taken at the national level for the implementation of resolution 1373 (2001). It also shows that focus must now be placed on evaluating the implementation of the measures and coordinating the mechanisms adopted. For those reasons, the Rio Group notes with great interest CTED's proposed priorities in the areas of technical assistance, developing a better communications strategy and pledging further efforts towards strengthening collaboration and cooperation with the other committees established under resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1540 (2004).

Since the adoption of resolution 1373 (2001) and the establishment of the Counter-Terrorism Committee (CTC) and its Executive Directorate, the United Nations has taken significant steps towards collaboration and cooperation in the fight against terrorism. This is the case of the General Assembly's adoption of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which will undergo a collective review during September of this year.

The Strategy and the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force provide an excellent opportunity to enhance the United Nations system's capacity to identify assistance needs and real possibilities for cooperation by linking the stakeholders in the fight against terrorism.

Accordingly, the Rio Group recognizes the importance of CTED's support to Member States in implementing the Strategy as a member of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, but also when fulfilling its mandate to promote the development of assistance programmes for Member States and in coordinating efforts with international, regional and subregional organizations in the fight against terrorism. With these aims in mind, the Rio Group is of the view that the CTC should strengthen its activities to facilitate contact between donors and cooperation recipients, and should promote greater interaction to identify thematic areas and country priorities in this field.

In our view, this contribution will significantly help to progressively strengthen the United Nations system in achieving the necessary coherence and coordination in its efforts to fight terrorism. This is our common task.

The resolution through which the Security Council will renew the mandate of CTED for a two-year period envisages an interim review. The Rio Group hopes that this review will provide a new opportunity to strengthen the United Nations response through a better and more coherent coordination of its efforts to fight terrorism.

We also trust that this Council will conduct the review in consultation with and with the participation of the wider United Nations membership.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Ms. Rodríguez de Ortiz (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, upon your skilful presidency of the Security Council during March, and would like to thank you, Sir, for convening this open debate on the threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts. My delegation aligns itself with the statement made by the Ambassador of Mexico, speaking on behalf of the Rio Group.

The Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela repeats its total condemnation of all acts of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable acts, and reaffirms its commitment to combat terrorism in all its forms and manifestations in strict observance of international law, international norms for the protection of human rights and of international humanitarian law. Our country has reaffirmed this commitment at all relevant international forums. The fundamental expression of this policy has been the strengthening of our body of law geared towards the prevention of terrorist acts and the adoption of measures to strengthen models for regional and global cooperation in the fight against this scourge.

In keeping with this struggle, our country also reaffirms its commitment to the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. We believe that, in the fight against terrorism, actions must be in compliance with the Charter of the United Nations. All States must ensure that the measures adopted in this area comply with the obligations that they are under in accordance with international law, in particular international human rights norms, international refugee law and international humanitarian law. The fight against terrorism cannot be an excuse to justify violations of international law.

Moreover, in the fight against terrorism, as is the case with other problems that affect and concern the international community, we reject unilateral practices and assessments based on subjective criteria that are not in keeping with the global and universal approach that they should follow. The elaboration of unilateral reports lacking substance does not contribute to resolving the problem. We reaffirm our belief that multilateral cooperation under the auspices of the United Nations is the most effective method by which to combat international terrorism.

What must be achieved now, in the short term, is consensus on the definition of the term "terrorism", a definition that must be balanced in all its parameters. In that regard, terrorism should not be equated with the legitimate struggle of peoples under colonial or foreign domination or under foreign occupation for their self-determination and their national liberation.

It is crucial that we deny opportunities to those individuals who commit terrorist acts. All States must cooperate fully in accordance with international law to locate, capture, deny safe haven to and bring to justice, on the basis of the principle of prosecution or extradition and in keeping with their own national legislation, those who support or facilitate the financing, planning, preparation or commission of terrorist acts or the provision of safe haven, or who participate in or plan to participate in such acts.

In that context, our delegation wishes to recall once again before this Council the extradition request that the Venezuelan Government submitted to the Government of the United States concerning Luis Posada Carriles, a known international criminal and terrorist, a fugitive from Venezuelan justice responsible for carrying out numerous terrorist plans, the most well known of which was the bombing of a Cubana de Aviación airplane over Barbados in 1976, claiming 73 innocent lives. The United States has ignored the extradition request submitted by the Venezuelan Government nearly three years ago, in full compliance with all the necessary requirements, and Luis Posada Carriles is still free on United States territory. The authorities of this country have taken only technical legal manoeuvres regarding charges of migration fraud against Posada Carriles, while ignoring the extradition request from Venezuela.

In addition to Council resolution 1373 (2001) and the Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, the United States should comply with the extradition treaty signed by our two countries in 1922. It is also bound by the provisions of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings and the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation — conventions to which it is a State party. It is obliged to extradite Luis Posada Carriles or to submit his case to its competent authorities for purposes of prosecution, without any exception and regardless of whether or not the crime was committed on United States territory.

The extradition request submitted by Venezuela for the terrorist Luis Posada Carriles has been endorsed by various international forums, including the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Movement, the heads of State and Government of the Bolivarian Alternative for the Peoples of Latin America — ALBA — the States parties of MERCOSUR, and the heads of State and Government of the Ibero-American States.

The case of the terrorist Luis Posada Carriles is an example that demonstrates and affirms the double standards of a Government that claims to fight terrorism while approving terrorist methods through its conduct. Unfortunately, terrorism will not be defeated if we continue to act in a selective manner and apply double-standard policies.

Once again we repeat our request that the Counter-Terrorism Committee examine and verify the United States compliance with its obligations in the fight against terrorism in accordance with resolution 1373 (2001) and the previously mentioned legal instruments in the specific case of our extradition request concerning the terrorist Posada Carriles.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Argentina.

Mr. Argüello (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to start by expressing my delegation's great appreciation for this opportunity to participate in the work of the Council in these open debates, which allow us to express our positions and, above all, allow countries not Council members to interact with the Council. For reasons of time, I have decided to shorten my statement, but copies of the original will be distributed.

Allow me, Mr. President, to thank you for this opportunity to comment on the latest developments in the legal and political activities of the Security Council with regard to the issue of threats to international security caused by terrorist acts.

Argentina has been victim of bloody attacks in its own territory. This week is another sad anniversary of the attack on the Embassy of Israel. We remain committed to bringing to justice the perpetrators of these tragic acts.

My country regrets that no progress has been made in the work of the Sixth Committee's working group charged with finalizing the negotiation of the comprehensive convention on the fight against terrorism. We believe that if we had had that legal instrument during the past months it would have allowed us to better frame and identify the barbaric terrorist acts that we referred to and to prosecute those responsible and condemn them legally and politically. The convention must be finalized, even more so now, after the adoption of the United Nations Counter-Terrorism Strategy that was approved by the General Assembly, which is to be revised this year.

We align ourselves with the statement made today by the Ambassador Heller of Mexico on behalf of the Rio Group. As he indicated, the mandate review in accordance with the Security Council resolution will allow us to take stock of the new institutional and operational arrangements submitted for our consideration, which should be accompanied by in-depth political action to resolve the political problems underlying terrorism, in particular the conflict in the Middle East.

We should not neglect to point out that more emphasis could be given to the work to ensure compliance with human rights in the fight against terrorism, especially with regard to the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) and the Special Rapporteur on this subject. This is an essential aspect to which Argentina has always attached great importance. We support the proposals regarding personnel, especially the need to have experts of diverse disciplines.

Perhaps further attention should be given to strengthening relations with international organizations of the United Nations system with specific competencies in the mentioned areas, for example maritime or aerial security. We also believe that the

work of CTED, the Counter-Terrorism Committee and INTERPOL could be further enhanced in light of resolution 1699 (2006), an aspect that perhaps could have been considered in further detail in the document.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Israel.

Mr. Carmon (Israel): Allow to me to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your able stewardship of the Council this month, and thank you for convening this important debate. My delegation wishes to welcome the Executive Director of the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED), Mr. Mike Smith, and thank him for his informative briefing and for all his efforts in reviewing the organization of the Directorate and its methods of work.

Israel views the Counter-Terrorism Committee and its Executive Directorate as fundamental pillars of the United Nations system's efforts to help Member States deal with the scourge of terrorism. As such, we strongly support the work of the Committee and CTED.

Earlier this year, the Counter-Terrorism Committee endorsed the revised organizational plan for CTED, which will serve to strengthen CTED and improve its operations. As Mr. Smith noted in his briefing, CTED today spends less time focusing on whether States understand the threat of terrorism and more on assessing their capacities and capabilities. In that respect, CTED plays a crucial role as a facilitator between donor and recipient countries on technical support and assistance. Israel, for its part, supports those efforts and is poised to provide assistance.

As my delegation has previously noted, the preliminary implementation assessment will be useful in evaluating Member States' capabilities. We wish to stress that follow-up and review are crucial to the process. The preliminary implementation assessment must move beyond the paper stage to concrete and practical action. Israel looks forward to reviewing its own preliminary implementation assessment and seeing how the assessment can be integrated into our national counter-terrorism strategies.

Israel also welcomes the need for CTED to participate in the work of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force, which was established to assist Member States in their implementation of the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy. The unanimous adoption by the General Assembly of the Strategy gave it a universal mandate and marks an important achievement for the international community. The challenge, however, remains in how the Strategy's commitments will be translated into concrete action to prevent terrorist acts and prosecute and punish those who carry them out.

The Strategy and Task Force are also fundamental in reminding us that terrorism has real consequences and grave effects on civilians, who are the primary targets and victims of terrorism. While our debate this morning focuses on the technical aspects of countering terrorism, we surely cannot forget the heavy price we all pay when terror strikes in the heart of our cities and towns. Every victim has a name, and each victim has his or her own story. We cannot forget the human dimension — the face, so to speak, of the victims — even when discussing the technical aspects of countering terrorism.

Israel is a country that has been forced to live under the threat of terrorism since its inception. The vast majority of Israelis have firsthand knowledge of the devastating effects of terrorism. In fact, practically no family in Israel has been spared by terrorism, whether it be a loved one or friend, a neighbour or co-worker who was stolen away by a cruel, heartless and crushing act of terrorism. Beyond that, terrorism has disrupted and devastated daily life, as civilians must constantly live in fear of the next attack. Sadly, Israelis still feel today the threat of terrorism every day and everywhere, whether it be to our north, our south or even in the heartland of our country, as seen less than two weeks ago in the devastating and ruthless terrorist attack at the Mercaz HaRav seminary in Jerusalem, where eight boys were coldly murdered by a terrorist. We were disappointed, Mr. President, that, despite your efforts and those of many others, the Council was unable to condemn that heinous terrorist attack.

Over the years, Israel has learned how to confront terrorism, a global phenomenon that has unfortunately become known to many nations around the world. There are various tools available to confront terrorism, in addition to the venues we are discussing today. The Israeli experience has shown that there is great value and importance in the work of local authorities, national agencies and individuals on the ground, not only in preventing and responding to attacks and treating the victims, but more so in refusing to allow terrorism to derail and hijack our daily life.

While Israel has experienced terrorism as a specific threat, it has been noted time and again that terrorism knows no geographical boundaries or limitations and transcends borders and nations. Hence, it is incumbent on all States to adhere to their obligations under international law, including the relevant resolutions adopted by the Council, in particular resolution 1373 (2001), which calls on States to enforce their borders, prevent the movement of terrorists and refrain from supporting terrorists or their activities.

Despite the real urgency and need for States to implement resolution 1373 (2001), it is alarming that some Member States of this world body are not only negligent in shouldering their responsibilities, but actually host, support and sponsor terrorism. Surely the international community must impress on all States the need to end such behaviour. There can never be any justification for terrorism, and any attempt to explain or excuse it should be condemned.

Israel remains poised and ready to continue working with the Counter-Terrorism Committee and CTED to advance its objectives and improve its cooperation and engagement with Member States. We welcome the extension of the mandate and are confident that the revised organizational plan of CTED will contribute to that effort and situate CTED in a central position to assist Member States in combating the global scourge of terrorism.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Sadeghi (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset, I wish to thank you very much, Mr. President, for having convened this open debate. I also wish to thank Mr. Smith for the briefing to the Council this morning.

The global fight against terrorism, with the United Nations at the forefront and playing a leading and central role, remains a priority for the international community. Undoubtedly, the role that the United Nations counter-terrorism bodies, including the Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate (CTED) should play to help Member States tackle this problem is of high importance.

Despite certain achievements made by the United Nations counter-terrorism mechanisms in dealing with the menace of terrorism, the international community's efforts to tackle this threat have faced certain impediments along the way, which need to be addressed appropriately. For instance, an opposing unilateralist trend has, from the very outset, run the risk of arresting the momentum and undermining the universal consensus and thus damaging the overall effective fight against terrorism. The application of double standards by certain Powers in tackling terrorist activities and in fighting terrorism is yet another disturbing problem that the international community has witnessed for years, if not decades. Therefore, the counter-terrorism bodies of the United Nations should address such shortcomings more seriously and with more dedication.

Indeed, the success of the CTED and other counter-terrorism mechanisms of the United Nations in discharging their immense responsibilities depends on adopting and pursuing an integrated, non-selective and balanced approach to their implementation of the relevant Council resolutions.

Iran has taken serious steps in implementing the Security Council resolutions on terrorism, including resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). We have presented five national reports on our implementation of resolution 1373 (2001), and have included a section on the measures we have taken to implement resolution 1624 (2005) in our latest report to the Counter-Terrorism Committee. The concrete steps that our country has taken to implement the provisions of those resolutions, including intensifying our efforts to exert control over and maintain security on our borders, are elaborated in those reports.

Moreover, Iran has fought a costly and deadly war against drug trafficking, which originates in Afghanistan. Given the fact that drug trafficking has served as one of the main sources of financing for certain terrorist groups that are based in Afghanistan, our efforts to fight drug trafficking have unquestionably made a fundamental contribution to the global fight against terrorism. Thus far, Iran has shouldered this burden almost single-handedly. In order to continue this fight, it is imperative that the international community make a more serious contribution, and pay greater attention, to this important aspect of fighting terrorism.

As one of the first victims of terrorism in the region, Iran has been unwavering in its efforts to fight

this threat and has always strongly condemned this vicious menace in all its forms and manifestations. We have been suffering from the atrocious terrorist activities that have been perpetrated in Iraq and Afghanistan against our diplomats and nationals. Iranian diplomats and an Iranian journalist were among the first victims during the Taliban occupation of Mazar-e-Sharif in Afghanistan in 1998. The terrorist activities in Iraq have also inflicted much pain and suffering on our nation. Just two days ago, a group of Iranian pilgrims who had made their way to Karbala to pay tribute to their late Imam were martyred there by terrorists, together with dozens of innocent Iraqi people.

The increasing heinous and cold-blooded State terrorism perpetrated by the Israeli regime in the Palestinian territories are also of serious concern to the international community. With deep anguish and concern, the entire world has been witnessing the unspeakable crimes of the Israeli regime against the Palestinian people. The State terrorism perpetrated by that regime in the Palestinian territories and its shocking war crimes have been continuing, in the absence of any meaningful action by the Security Council.

As I said earlier, the application of double standards in dealing with terrorism and terrorist groups is yet another important matter of grave concern that seriously undermines the international community's collective fight against terrorism. The Islamic Republic of Iran has been subjected to various acts of terrorism by certain terrorist groups over the past three decades. In that regard, a particular reference should be made to the terrorist Mujaheddin e Khalq Organization (MKO), which has thus far carried out more than 600 terrorist operations in Iran, resulting in the killing and wounding of many civilians and officials and in damage to our nation's property. That terrorist group has also designed numerous atrocious ploys to incite acts of terrorism within and outside the country. The MKO was long supported and sheltered by the former Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein and was also engaged in Saddam's bloody campaigns against the Iraqi people.

Despite its heinous and appalling record of terrorist acts and incitement to terrorism — which are well known — and despite the fact that it was officially designated as a terrorist group by the United States and the European Union (EU), the elements and members of the MKO continue to enjoy support and receive safe haven in the United States and some European countries, including some EU member States. That support clearly violates the provisions of the relevant Security Council resolutions, particularly resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005).

There are certain other terrorist groups that, with the support of some Western countries, have committed acts of terrorism against the Iranian people. Over the past several years, the Jundullah terrorist group has attacked and killed dozens of people in the eastern and south-eastern parts of the country in an attempt to create an environment of intimidation and insecurity. Unfortunately, the terrorist acts of these groups have not been unequivocally rejected and condemned by certain countries in the West, and, in clear violation of Security Council resolutions on terrorism, these terrorist groups have even been given the chance to operate freely in certain European countries and in the United States and to plan and incite terrorism against our nation, including by using the media.

A case in point was the outrageous act committed on 1 April 2007 by the Voice of America's Persian Service television channel, in which the channel supportively and sympathetically provided the head of the Jundullah terrorist group with an opportunity to incite terrorism and violence in Iran and to shamelessly describe his vicious terrorist activities. That was a flagrant violation of the Security Council resolutions on terrorism and a clear example of public endorsement of and incitement to terrorism.

We strongly believe that terrorism and terrorist groups should be condemned and fought without discrimination and that there can be no justification for any inaction, negligence or use of double standards in fighting this menace.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now call on the representative of the United States of America, who has requested the floor to make an additional statement.

Ms. Willson (United States of America): We have taken the floor to respond to some statements that we have heard here this morning. Contrary to those statements, the United States has taken a number of actions with respect to Luis Posada Carriles. In taking those steps, the United States has acted in accordance with international law as well as with our domestic legal framework that provides for due process and

various constitutional safeguards. As is the case in democracies around the world that follow the rule of law, those safeguards provide that an individual cannot be brought to trial or extradited unless sufficient evidence has been established that he committed the offence with which he has been charged. In the United States, that standard is described as "probable cause".

Permit me to give the Council a brief overview of steps that the United States has taken with respect to Posada within that legal framework. Posada entered the United States illegally in early 2005. He was detained by immigration authorities in the United States on 17 May 2005 and was, in accordance with United States law, placed in removal proceedings. The immigration judge who handled the removal proceedings ordered that Posada be removed from the United States on 27 September 2005. That order remains in effect. The United States has been seeking ways to implement it in accordance with the terms of the order and United States regulations that implement the obligations of the United States under the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

Specifically, at the time that the immigration judge ordered Posada removed, the immigration judge also determined that Posada could not be removed either to Cuba or to Venezuela, as it was more likely than not that he would be tortured if he were so transferred. As a matter of United States immigration law, the United States is not in a position to remove Posada to either country.

Moreover, the United States sought and obtained a criminal indictment charging Posada with violations of our immigration laws. The Federal District Court, a part of the independent judiciary of the United States, handling that case, dismissed the indictment. The United States filed a notice appealing the Court's decision on 5 June 2007. Posada also remains under investigation for past activities.

In the meantime, Posada is subject to the order of removal issued by the immigration judge and is without legal status in the United States. He is also subject to an order of supervision from the Department of Homeland Security, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which imposes certain restrictions on him, including reporting and monitoring requirements.

In sum, the United States continues to be engaged in an ongoing series of actions consistent with our legal requirements and due process with respect to Posada.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mr. Quiñones Sánchez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba prays your indulgence, Mr. President, but we cannot allow the manipulation and deception. We feel obliged to respond to the comments made by the delegation of the United States concerning the well-known international terrorist Luis Posada Carriles.

Once again, in this Chamber, we reiterate that the claim that the United States authorities were guided by international law is false. If the United States authorities had acted in conformity with international law and had abided by the commitments they undertook through a number of international treaties to which the United States is party and complied with the relevant Security Council resolutions on the fight against terrorism, including 1373 (2001), Posada Carriles would have already been charged with terrorism in the United States, or at the very least extradited to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. That, unfortunately, has not happened.

We still await a response to the questions posed by our delegation, and it seems that we will never get one. They have to avoid at all costs the international community becoming aware of the terrorist actions carried out by Luis Posada Carriles when he acted on behalf of the Central Intelligence Agency. Despite the great deal of evidence to back this up, at no time has the Government of the United States manifested its intention to prosecute Luis Posada Carriles for his terrorist activities.

The fight against terrorism requires seriousness, commitment and, above all, political will. Statements to the media are insufficient. Double standards in the fight against terrorism should cease. It will not be possible to eradicate terrorism if only some acts of terrorism are condemned while others are tolerated, justified or ignored, or when the question is simply manipulated to promote petty political interests.

Cuba reaffirms its urgent appeal to the Security Council to appropriately consider its complaints and to act upon them.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): I now give the floor to the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela.

Ms. Rodríguez de Ortiz (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): Thank you, Mr. President, for having granted me the floor — I do apologize. However, I feel obliged to speak again, despite the length of the meeting.

My delegation simply cannot understand why the United States is failing to comply with an extradition treaty. This is all the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is asking for: that the United States should honour the commitments it has undertaken in the agreement between our two countries. We have fulfilled all the requirements to enable the terrorist, Luis Posada Carriles, to be arrested and extradited to our country, where we will try him for his terrorist acts.

The Government of the United States has at its disposal all the necessary documentary evidence of the terrorist nature of the acts of Luis Posada Carriles and yet, despite this, has chosen to protect him. All he has been charged with by the United States Government is minor immigration offences which allow him his freedom in this country.

We are faced with a case where a terrorist is being protected. The attitude of the Government of the United States in this case is a travesty of justice and an insult to the memory of the victims of the terrorist acts, and it adds to the pain and suffering of the families of those victims.

Moreover, there is today a new element. It would be absurd to suppose that Venezuela would practise torture when we faithfully observe the maxim "pacta sunt servanda" and fulfil our obligations. We are a party to the Convention against Torture, and we respect its provisions. The Security Council must review this case and the Counter-Terrorism Committee must assess it, with a view to prevailing on the Government of the United States to comply with its commitment to fight terrorism and to fulfil its obligations under international law.

The President (*spoke in Russian*): There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.5855/Corr.1

Security Council

Sixty-third year

Provisional

5855th meeting
Wednesday, 19 March 2008, 10 a.m.
New York

Corrigendum

Page 9, first column

The name of the speaker for the United States of America should read **Mr. Wolff.**

08-28057 (E)